


LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MINISTER

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1865

1865

1865

1865

1865

1865


1865

1865

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

NOTES
ON THE
RISE, PROGRESS, AND PROSPECTS
OF THE
Schism from the Church of Rome,
CALLED THE
GERMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH,
INSTITUTED BY
JOHANNES RONGE AND I. CERZKI,
IN OCTOBER 1844,

ON OCCASION OF THE PILGRIMAGE TO THE
HOLY COAT AT TREVES.



AUTHOR OF "A RESIDENCE IN NORWAY," "A TOUR IN SWEDEN," "NOTES OF A TRAVELLER," A TRANSLATION OF "THE HEIMSKRINGLA," ETC.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON :
LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS,
PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1846.

BX47
13

25-102

LONDON :
Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-Street-Square.

PREFACE.

THE establishment, and endowment by the State, of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is the great question of the nineteenth century. Religious feeling, raised by principle or prejudice, is already agitating the great mass of the Protestant population. The educational endowments of Maynooth as a seminary for priests, and of four colleges for the lay community of the Roman Catholic Faith, are considered, whether justly or not, as indications that these are but preliminary steps to a great organic change in the social state and policy of Great Britain—to the formal acknowledgment and endowed establishment of a new body in her social structure, the clergy of the Church of Rome. The breeze which precedes the storm is already ruffling the public mind.

Political expediency, the necessity of conciliating five millions of the population of Ireland, stands on one side of this great question. The weight of the deliberate judgment of many of our

most prudent and cautious statesmen, including, it is supposed, the present ministry as well as the most eminent of their political opponents, is thrown into the scale of the expediency, the instant urgent necessity, of Catholic endowment ; and but for the approach of the term when representatives in Parliament must account to their constituents, and might endanger their seats in the next Parliament by a decided opposition to public opinion, or prejudice, on this momentous question, the endowment of the Catholic Church in Ireland might probably have been carried this session with the same, or nearly the same majorities in both Houses, as the endowment of the Catholic colleges. The two measures are, however, to every unbiassed mind, essentially distinct. Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley justly argued that the educational measures they proposed stood upon their own ground, on the fulfilment of one of the great duties of modern governments, the education of the people, whether priests or laity, by the means the people prefer and will alone use. No reasonable unprejudiced man, of any sect or denomination of Christians, will deny that to educate the people is the first step to civilise, enlighten, and even convert the people ; that it is the duty of a Christian govern-

ment ; and that, however exaggerated the importance may be which it is the fashion of the day to attribute to national establishments of schools and colleges, if these are to be of any use or influence at all, they must be suited to the social and intellectual state of the people or classes for whom they are established. The wise or rather wary ministry are entitled to say, with perfect good faith, either that they consider the educational endowments final measures, or preliminary measures ; either distinct and unconnected with any intention to establish and endow the Catholic Church, or as initiative, preparatory, and necessarily leading to that end — just as they find public opinion favourable or adverse. This is not the position of a high-minded ministry ; but it is safe, very safe ; and what is done is in itself good.

On the other side of this great question stand the religious principles, feelings, and prejudices of the great mass of the Protestant population of the United Kingdoms. It may with the many be ignorance worked upon by zealots at public meetings, and by the press, until it becomes a blind and dangerous fanaticism ; but with the great body of the middle and upper classes, it unquestionably is the sober, sincere, religious conviction of men of every Protestant sect, and of men not uninstructed

in their faith, and representing truly the mind of the country, that stands opposed to Catholic endowment for any political expediency. Four fifths of the inhabitants of Great Britain—twenty millions of Protestants—are opposed to the state-establishment of the priesthood of five millions of Roman Catholics, as a new, acknowledged, and endowed Interest in the social body: and of the twenty millions, a number equal to the Catholic population, or about five millions, of Wesleyans, Free Church Presbyterians, and others supporting their own clergy, are entitled in equity to the same social influence, endowment, and acknowledged legal status, as it is proposed to confer on their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. This is the true state of the parties in this great national question. No individuals are indifferent to it. All are taking a side, all are arraying themselves to oppose or support Catholic endowment, and a little time, a little irritation, a nearer approach of the question to a legislative shape, are all that is wanting to raise a bitter spirit of religious division in the country.

The question of Catholic endowment, besides being handled, as all great social interests with us too often are, merely as a party question, has only been considered as a religious question, or as one

of political expediency. There is a third point of view, in which, from want of information on what is doing in other countries, it is seldom considered, viz. how is the Church of Rome working now on the civilisation, and social and moral well-being of the countries of mixed Catholic and Protestant population in which it has been endowed and established along with the Lutheran Church? How is it working in Prussia? Is it for good, or for evil? Here, if anywhere in political action, experience may be of use to a government proposing to adopt the same measures — the endowment and acknowledgment of the Roman Catholic Church, as an integral part of our social structure, under some kind of Concordat with the Pope settling the relations of the Catholic priesthood to the Sovereign or State. The very remarkable event in the history of the nineteenth century recorded in the following pages — a pilgrimage unequalled since the middle ages in the numbers and superstition of the pilgrims, and in the display of the material physical power of the established endowed Church of Rome even under an autocratic military government — may make men pause. It will be prudent to look over our neighbour's hedge, and see how the endowed established Roman Catholic hierarchy is working there on the

social condition of the people, and on the safety and tranquillity of the sovereign. It will be wise to consider more narrowly what may be the consequences of establishing any similar influence and interest in our social structure. Every contribution, however insignificant in itself, that gives information on what is going on in other countries of mixed Protestant and Catholic population, is of some value at the present moment when we are on the brink of a gulf, yet hesitating and doubtful whether to take a desperate leap, or to remain quietly, as we are, on our side. In this view, the Author has been at considerable trouble to collect the following Notes on the great religious movement in Germany—the pilgrimage of a million and a half of people to the holy coat exhibited at Trèves last autumn; and on the reaction of that movement, whether it is to be transitory or permanent, which, under Ronge, Czerzki, and other good and zealous men, has raised a German-Catholic Church in opposition to the hierarchy and idolatry of the Church of Rome. The Author has endeavoured to give an impartial view of both churches; and hopes his contribution may be useful to those who may wish to consider Catholic endowment in Ireland in its social results.



NOTES

ON THE

RISE, PROGRESS, AND PROSPECTS

OF THE

GERMAN - CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I.

CHRISTIANITY, after passing through fifteen centuries of superstition, one of reform, one of infidelity, and one of indifference, has reached an age in which all these are blended—an age of contrasts, in which superstition, pure religion, infidelity, and indifference are revived, and walking side by side, in every country and class of society. One of the events which express this character of our times very strongly, is the schism from the church of Rome of the German Catholics who adopt the views of Johannes Ronge and

J. Czerski, and are now establishing congregations of a German Catholic or Christian Catholic church purified from the errors and abuses of Popery, and independent of the power, spiritual or ecclesiastical, of the Pope, and of the hierarchy of the church of Rome. "Let me be rightly understood," says Czerski, a Catholic priest, who has renounced the Roman Catholic church and its errors, has entered into the married state, and joined the German Catholic church, and who, next to Ronge, is the most eminent of its founders,— "I renounce the Pope and the false doctrines of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, but I remain a Catholic Christian, a Catholic priest. I will not be a Lutheran, nor a Calvinist, nor a Mennonite, nor a Greek Christian,— I will remain a Catholic, but according to the words of the Scriptures,— according to the precepts of Christ and his Apostles, I am and will be an Apostolic Catholic Christian,— an Apostolic Christian priest."*

This movement is but in progress. Where is

* Rechtfertigung meines Abfalles von der römischen Hofkirche. Ein offenes Sendschreiben an alle die da hören, sehen, und prüfen wollen und können, von Czerski, Apostolisch Katholischem Priester in Schneidemühl. Bromberg, 1845.

the prophet who can foresee its end? In religious action, much more even than in political, the merest trifle, as all history tells us, may become the apparent cause of the most important revolutions. The injudicious exercise of their right of patronage by a few lay patrons in Scotland, was the apparent cause of the establishment of the Free Church,—threw the people back upon first principles, which had long been dormant. The visible cause of the Reformation itself, in the 16th century, was the barefaced sale, in the markets and fairs of Germany, of indulgences, and remissions of sins, by the Pope's agent, Tetsler. It would be presumption in the best informed to hazard a decided opinion, at present, on what is to be the end and effect of this religious movement in Germany,—whether it is to be a heavy vital blow to the church of Rome,—a seed from which is to spring up, in every Catholic country, a Catholicism without the Pope,—or whether, being planted in the soft soil of the German mind of the present times, in which every thing new springs up, but withers away before reaching any maturity for want of firm support in the character of the people,—it is to linger on for a short time in a stunted existence, until swept away by the first popular novelty in philosophy, or the first opera,

or actress of great merit that appears on the German stage.

The history, however, of this schism gives much matter for reflection—gives many curious and characteristic glimpses into the social state of the German people, their religious and civil condition in the present age, and will enable the English reader to form a more just estimate of the actual progress of the public mind in Germany, in this century, than the accounts which some writers give us of the general education of the people by national schools, and a compulsory attendance on them; or by the great, and very probably real, advance and general diffusion of taste and execution in the fine arts—in music, statuary, architecture, painting, poetry.

The Bishop of Trèves, Dr. William Arnoldi, issued a circular notice, dated Trèves, 6th July, 1844, and signed by the Episcopal Vicar-General Von Müller, that in consequence of the urgent request of the clergy and body of believers in the bishopric of Trèves, the holy relic preserved in the cathedral, being the coat without seam worn by our Saviour, would be exhibited for the space of six weeks from the 18th of the following August. “That the wish of all who have the pious intention of making a pilgrimage to Trèves, to

behold and venerate the holy garment of our Divine Redeemer may be fulfilled, and each may gain the entire remission of his sins, granted by Pope Leo X. under date of 26th January, 1514.* The said Pope, namely, with the wish that the Cathedral of Trèves, which has the honour of preserving the coat without a seam of our Lord Jesus Christ, and many other holy relics, may be distinguished by suitable grandeur of establishment and splendour of ornament,—gives, according to the words of the aforesaid bull, a full remission of sins, in all future time, to all believers who go in pilgrimage to the exhibition of the holy coat at Trèves, sincerely confess and repent of their sins, or at least have a firm intention to do so,—and moreover contribute with a liberal hand to the suitable decoration of the cathedral of Trèves, as recommended by the holy father, but which still remains imperfect from the end of the last century.” This is a translation of the main part of the brief of Bishop Arnoldi, of 4th July, 1844; the rest of it contains directions for preserving

* The same pope, Leo X., by his bull giving remissions to Germany at the same period, viz. 1517, and sending Tetsler to sell them through the country, gave rise to Luther's opposition and the Reformation.

order in the processions of pilgrims, preventing confusion in the access to the sight of the relic, and such matters of police—matters which appear to have been exceedingly well attended to, judiciously arranged, and fully accomplished.

As an introduction to the public exhibition of the relic, a history of the holy coat in the cathedral of Trèves was, by order of the bishop, drawn up by Professor Marx, of the Episcopal Seminary, and published, with the Bishop's approbation, by Lints, at Trèves, 1844.

From this history it appears that Bishop Arnoldi, who was consecrated in 1842, had previous to his consecration a conference, at Coblenz, with Prince Metternich, concerning a holy nail, which, as well as the holy coat, had for many ages belonged to the cathedral of Trèves, and which nail, according to the report of M. Pessina, the secretary of the cathedral of Prague, had by some special circumstances known only to a few persons, come into the possession of Prince Metternich. The Bishop had intended to bring back the holy nail with suitable solemnity, reunite this relic to the holy coat, and exhibit both together to the pious veneration of the people. But Prince Metternich somehow never performed his promise of restoring the holy nail, if he had it, and Bishop

Arnoldi was at last obliged to proceed without the nail, and exhibit the holy coat by itself.

The early history of this relic is somewhat obscure. The Empress Helena, who was either the mother, the wife, or the mistress of the Emperor Constantine — historians have not determined which — was born some time in the third century, either at Trèves, or at Drepona, or at York — historians have not determined which — and was crowned after the victory of Constantine over Maxentius, in the year 312 ; and Constantine and the Empress Helena embraced the Christian faith, and put an end to the persecution of the Christians. About the year 326, this Empress Helena repaired to the Holy Land, discovered, by inquiry among the inhabitants, the exact spot of the crucifixion, the holy grave, and other sacred places, and recovered the cross itself, the inscription that was nailed on it, and the holy nails which had fastened our Saviour to the tree. She acquired also on this journey — according to the best history taught at Trèves in the nineteenth century — the garment without a seam of our Saviour, the identical coat for which the soldiers cast lots (John, xix. 24.), and out of regard for Trèves — by some reputed her birth-place, and in that age a city inferior only to Rome itself, and the capital of Western Europe

—she bestowed this relic on the church of Trèves through St. Agrocius, then its bishop. This is the tradition of the Chapter of the Cathedral of Trèves.

How wood, woollen, or iron could be preserved from natural decay for 326 years, unless miraculously, is not evident * ; and if miraculously pre-

* The preservation of the cloth in which mummies are enveloped for a period much longer, perhaps twice as long as the age claimed for the holy tunic, may appear to invalidate this objection to its authenticity. But the mummy-cloth was embalmed as well as the mummy. It was impregnated with the same resinous or bituminous matter which preserved the body, and which replaced the perishable substance by a process similar to that by which organic remains are fossilised.

The tunic appears to have been covered or lined for its preservation with another of the same size and shape ; and although to the eye they appear but one, they are not connected, but can be distinctly separated. The material of the upper one, supposed to be woollen, cannot be distinguished exactly ; but that of the under one, or lining, appears to have been silk of a greenish colour. The upper one, which is the tunic, has peeled off in flakes, and fallen from age into decay ; but what remains is of a dark red colour, and the figures on it of a yellow. These figures, which by a microscopic examination, made by the Vicar-General Dr. Müller and the Prebendary Von Willmowsky, in 1843, are declared to have been birds with a crown similar to a peacock's crest on the heads, and of which the feet and heads are distinguishable, furnish the grounds to Professors Gildemeister and Von Sybel for doubting, as hereafter stated,

served, and miraculously discovered by the Empress Helena, how these relics of wood, woollen, or iron, came to be lost and forgotten again for some ten or twelve hundred years, and this woollen relic at least not produced — even according to the history taught at Trèves — until the year 1056, or, according to others, 1196, and according to any historical document, not until 1514, when this bull was issued, granting remission of sins to all who went in pilgrimage to it, and contributed with a liberal hand to the funds of the cathedral — are circumstances not historically and physically of self-evident fact, and requiring no explanation. But the puzzling circumstance is, that according to Gregory of Tours, there was another coat of our Saviour preserved in Galatia,

whether it be a Palestine garment at all. The colour also, dark red, gives reason for supposing that this garment has originally been purple ; and the learned professors, taking the measure of the garment, calculating the quantity and price of the dye stuff necessary, and reducing the whole, together with the relative value of money, to the present times, calculate that such a garment must have cost, in the days of our Saviour, a sum equivalent to 139 Prussian thalers if made of very thin woollen stuff, or 220 thalers if made of thick, or from about 16*l.* to about 25*l.* ; and maintain that such a luxury of colour and price is inconsistent with all that Scripture tells us of our Saviour's character and worldly circumstances.

and there was one at Jaffa according to Fredegor, and more perplexing still, there is one in the church of Argenteuil in France, for which, on the authority of the chronicler Robert de Monte, and of papal bulls and testimonies, the palm of authenticity is claimed at the present day, in opposition to the garment at Trèves, by the French clergy.* The learned Professor gets over these conflicting garments ingeniously enough. They are genuine, but are not *Tunica*,—not the *Tunica inconsutilis*, the coat without a seam,—but the *cappa*, the upper garment or mantle; and the Professor says, the Abbé Calmet in his Dictionary, and the reformer Calvin, both agree in calling the vestment at Argenteuil a mantle, and not a *tunica*; and it by no means follows that these other relics are spurious because the relic of Trèves is genuine. But it is not so easy to escape from the learning and research of Professors Gildermeister and Von Sybel of Bonn, who examine the authenticity of this relic, and prove that it is not a Palestine garment at all †, and that in the Christian world there

* Des Vêtements de N. S. Jésus Christ honorés dans l'église d'Argenteuil près Paris, et dans la Cathédrale de Trèves. A la sacristie d'Argenteuil. October, 1844.

† From the circumstance that this garment has been ornamented with flowers and birds, apparently peacocks,

are eighteen or twenty coats *, each of which, on equally good grounds, is asserted to be the identical coat worn by our Saviour, for which the soldiers cast lots, according to St. John's Gospel;

and the Jewish law (Deut. iv. 17.) prohibits the image of any bird specially, or of any living thing being in the land. In the time of Christ, this law was so strictly adhered to by the Jews, that several insurrections against the Romans are stated by Josephus to have arisen from the attempt to put images, and such ornaments representing living animals, on the public buildings. The learning, research, and reading bestowed on examining the Holy Coat, by Dr. Gildermeister and Dr. Von Sybel of Bonn, in two pamphlets, published 1845, have not been equalled, perhaps, since the days of Gibbon.

* Edward the Confessor bestowed one, or a part of one, on a church at Westminster, in 1038. Cologne had one; the Vatican at Rome has one; Constantinople, Bremen, Trèves itself, besides the one now exhibited, had one. The learned professors of Bonn, above mentioned, have discovered about twenty-two places claiming in the middle ages to be possessed of this relic; and trace the first appearance of this superstition and legend of the Holy Coat to the eleventh century.

It is necessary to observe that there can be but one holy coat, because, according to the history of all of them, it was spun and woven by the Virgin Mary for our Saviour when he was an infant, and miraculously grew with his growth, and never needed altering or lengthening. This part of the belief in it is essential to the symbolical meaning of the Holy Coat, as representing the one indivisible Church of Rome, which requires no altering, and is always the same, since the birth of Christ.

and each with its miracles, documents, or bulls, to prove its authenticity.

The coat without a seam, it is to be observed, which the soldiers would not divide into four parts, as they did the other garments, "being woven from the top throughout," is not merely a holy relic. It is held by the Roman Catholic clergy, that this description of the garment in the Gospel, is emblematic of the one and indivisible church of Rome, established at the Crucifixion; while the upper garments, divided into four parts, are typical of the four quarters of the universe, through which the faith of the one and indivisible church is to be diffused.

Our own protestant clergy are perhaps too fond of hunting after typical significations and symbolical allusions in scriptural texts and facts, which may never have been intended to cover any other meaning than the simple veritable circumstances or ideas related by the inspired writer, and which are generally more impressive, truthful, and precious for religion, in the plain obvious sense, without any sub-meaning at all, than when twisted into a theological conundrum of hidden allusion and symbolical meaning, by the ingenuity of the preacher. In this case, for instance, the simple natural incident of the four soldiers dividing the

garments that could be divided, into four parts, and casting lots for the one which could not be cut without spoiling it, because it was without seam, and worked, woven, or knit “from the top throughout,”— is just the very thing the soldiers were likely to do,— is an incident so natural and truthful, that it could not be invented,— and is far more valuable from this reality on the face of it, in its plain obvious sense, than all the sub-meanings which catholics or protestants can fancy under it. The sub-meaning, or pun, discovered by catholics under the name Peter (a rock), upon which the church of Rome, and the power of Saint Peter and his successors, is founded, should make the protestant preacher cautious of searching for more symbolical meanings and allusions than the inspired writers themselves have pointed out. He who rings the symbolical bells in his pulpit according to his own judgment or fancy, should remember what the bells in his steeple are telling him— “As the fool thinks, so the bell chinks.”

The veneration for relics springs from a nobler source than ignorance or superstition. Is it ignorance or superstition that makes the stern presbyterian regard with veneration the gown, the pulpit, the Bible of John Knox; the window at the head of the Canongate from which he preached; the

original manuscript of the solemn league and covenant; or that noblest of all the documents which any Christian church can produce, the Protest of the 376 ministers of the Free Church of Scotland, and their signatures to their instant resignation, for conscience sake, of all the worldly interests that men hold dear,— of their houses, homes, and comforts? Is it superstition that makes this document of the sincerity of those 376 remarkable men circulate in fac-simile— makes it to be venerated and preserved by all intelligent men in Scotland, however widely they may differ from the principle or doctrine of the Free Church, as the most interesting relic of our times? Is it ignorance that makes the most enlightened men of the age prize a relic of Sir Walter Scott, or Robert Burns,— makes them search with avidity for a genuine portrait, an autograph, or relic of any kind, of Shakspeare, Milton, or Newton? Is this ignorance, superstition, folly? If it were within the limits of possibility, and beyond all doubt on historical or physical grounds, that a genuine portrait of our Saviour did exist, or that his raiment, or the nails by which he was attached to the cross, were preserved unconsumed by moth, rust, damp, and other natural agencies of decay, during eighteen hundred and forty-five years,— would it

be ignorance, folly, and gross superstition to regard these relics with the same interest and veneration that the most enlightened men pay to similar relics of Shakspeare, Milton, Newton, Burns, or Scott? What is the intellectual value of a genuine relic, portrait, image, or other memorial of past events or persons? It must be a value founded in the natural constitution of the human mind, for it has been given to relics in all ages and in all stages of civilisation. The Israelites (Exodus xiii. 19.) took the bones — that is, the relics — of Joseph with them, on their flight out of Egypt. The most enlightened men, in the most civilised ages, render a similar respect to relics; and even the free-thinker, the infidel, the atheist, pays this homage to this natural feeling or principle in the human mind, and goes to Ferney for a hair from the periwig of Voltaire, or to America for the bones of Tom Paine. On what is this value founded?

The human mind has a natural and irresistible tendency in it towards truth. All intellectual movement springs from this tendency. All intellectual enjoyment, all the pleasure we derive from the fine arts, for instance, may perhaps be traced up to this element in the constitution of mind, to the gratification of this tendency. To

make a fact, to make a vivid defined whole, to raise an intellectual fact, although it be out of fiction, out of imagined, not out of natural existences, to give a distinct form to the vague, to combine new and unknown conceptions into one whole, one fact which the mind can grasp as a reality,— to *individualise*, in a word,— is poetry, painting, statuary, music. The intellectual pleasure these arts give us is the gratification of this tendency of mind towards truth, that is to say, towards intellectual truth, towards a distinct connected representation to our minds of a whole of ideas which may or may not be naturally true. A play of Shakspeare is intellectually true, without being naturally true,— is more true than the matter of fact itself. The fact itself which poetry or painting presents to the mind, may be a false fact, a matter of fiction; yet the poet or painter individualises his fiction, makes his wildest fancies intellectual truths to the human mind by the distinct impressions of them which his genius has the power of giving. Now, the veneration or love for relics, or memorials of past events or persons, for portraits, images, autographs, books, bones, clothes, hair, holy coats, nails, &c., appears founded on this same element in the constitution of the human mind. The relic helps to realise

the idea, to individualise the conception, and this individualisation is, from the tendency of mind towards intellectual truth, the highest of our mental gratifications. This appears to be the true value of relics.

The great and fundamental error of the Roman Catholic church is that it connects this mental gratification, in itself a natural and high gratification of the spiritual part of man, with the Christian religion, although in reality it has no more connexion with Christianity than the bodily gratification of eating, drinking, or any other physical enjoyment. It enables, no doubt, the Roman Catholic believer to individualise his conceptions, and thereby to dwell upon them with a sustained devotion, fervour, and enthusiasm, and ecstasy, of which the Protestant believer is, from the very nature of the human mind, altogether incapable. But of what are his conceptions? Of the doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles? No! but of his or their bodily appearance, presence, or sufferings. This is not religion. It is from this point — in itself a true and natural element in the constitution of the mind of man — that the Roman Catholic church has diverged from genuine Christianity. It has built upon this element an idolatrous worship founded on imagina-

tion, and has placed the Christian religion in the mind of man, on the same basis as that on which poetry, painting, music stand; has made it an affair of imagination and intellectual pleasure, not a business of research and the intellectual exertion of reason and judgment. But Christianity is not a religion of imagination. It is founded on conviction, from reason and judgment applied to fact and doctrine.

It is true that the enlightened Catholic denies that the relics, images, pictures, crosses of his church, are intended to be objects of adoration. These objects are presented by his church upon the admitted and undeniable principle, that they act upon the mind, and enable it to grasp more strongly the impressions they represent; and it is not *to* them, but *through* them, that the Catholic prays and worships. But what is it the mind grasps through them? Is it the doctrine of Christian salvation, by seeing the coat worn by our Redeemer, or the nails by which he was attached to the cross, supposing these relics genuine? or is it only a lively picture in the mind, of the great fact of the crucifixion? A livelier impression of the scene of the crucifixion, and of every scriptural circumstance, event, or personage recorded in the Old or New Testament, cannot perhaps be again conceived by the mind of man, than those impres-

sions which Raphael, Michael Angelo, and other painters of sacred subjects of the high Italian school, have conceived and embodied in their works; but were these great artists better Christians—more embued with the principles, doctrines, and practice of the Christian religion—by having these livelier, more sublime impressions in their minds of the scriptural scenes? If Christianity was a religion of imagination, and its essence lay in the vivid impression of the facts of Scripture, apart from its doctrine, Raphael would stand above the apostle Paul as a Christian. This work of imagination is not religion. The enlightened Catholic, and the Council of Trent, in its last sitting in December, 1563, expressly disavow any direct adoration of relics and pictures; and that council, by which all points of church doctrine are regulated up to the present times, expressly directs bishops and priests “to take care in the teaching the due honour and veneration to be rendered to relics and sacred pictures, that the people do not believe there is any thing divine, or any power of miracles, in the relics or pictures themselves, as was the case of old among the heathen, who placed their trust in idols; but that the honour shown to them refers to the persons or things they represent.” Luther himself could

not give a more distinct negation to idol-worship, that is, to the adoration of the relics, or pictures, themselves; but under it is a recognition of saint-worship, and miracle-faith in what is represented by the pictures and relics. The distinction is too refined for the Catholic of common uneducated mind. The strong mental gratification of individualising vague impressions by an actual relic or picture, is placed before him, and he is told to abstain from the natural tendency of the human mind, and to be impressed not with the individual object presented to him, but with what it represents. The Catholic mind, even now in the nineteenth century, in the most enlightened, or at least most educated part of the Prussian kingdom, itself the most educated country in Europe, is not capable of this abstraction. On this occasion of exhibiting the holy coat, the relic itself, the holy coat, was the object of direct adoration by the multitude of pilgrims at Trèves. It was stated at the time in the newspapers, (in the Herold, No. 7. among others,) that eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the scene were ready to prove that the multitude, on their knees, were exclaiming — “Holy coat, to thee I come! Holy coat, to thee I pray! Holy coat, pray for me!”

It is certainly a very unexpected result of the

far-famed educational system of Prussia—of the boasted progress of the Prussian people in mental culture, and of the diffusion of suitable education among all by state schools, and a compulsory attendance on them by even the lowest classes, that here, in the very centre of all this school quackery, the people are in such a deplorable state of ignorance and superstition, that a Catholic priest has only to hoist a flag with a cross in it on the tower of his cathedral, and proclaim the display of a relic, which would scarcely have passed for genuine in the darkest of the middle ages, and he collects in eight weeks a million and a half of pilgrims to adore this relic,—a greater multitude than has been on foot in Europe at one time, on any one religious occasion, since the days of the first Crusades. If M. Cousins and other writers, who have explained and recommended to all Europe the Prussian system of national education, and its general diffusion, have not, owing to the false statements made to them, been imposing on public credulity, not above two or three per cent. of the Prussian population at present are without the benefit of school education. A whole generation has grown up since the system was established, twenty-five or thirty years ago, and trumpeted throughout Europe. Of the million

and a half of pilgrims who visited the holy coa at Trèves, from the adjacent cities and provinces of Prussia, a very small number, a trifling percentage, can have been ignorant, or untaught in reading, writing, arithmetic, singing, and the principles of their religion, whether Catholic or Lutheran, as taught in the Prussian schools. They are in the dilemma—M. Cousins, and the other writers on the Prussian school system—on confessing, either that they were imposed upon and unwittingly imposing upon the reading public of Europe, in their accounts of the efficiency and diffusion of education in Prussia; or, that education, as it is given in the Prussian schools—reading, writing, catechismal and other religious instruction—is of no value or power in society—is entirely neutralised and ineffective, owing to the want of that real education and mental exercise of a people given by their self-action in a free social state, in which every man thinks and acts for himself. The undeniable fact stands against these writers, that the public mind in the most educated and enlightened provinces of the Prussian kingdom, after a whole generation of them has been taught in the government schools, has shown itself to be in the same state in the nineteenth as it may have been in about the fourteenth century, with probably less energy.

The scene in the ancient city of Trèves, from the 8th of August, when the relic was displayed for the first time to the pious pilgrims, to the 7th of October, when it was again consigned to its shrine, must have very closely resembled the scenes of the tenth or eleventh century, when the Crusades were set on foot. Multitudes of pilgrims in processions formed by the throng of people in the narrow roads and streets, with banners flying, crucifixes borne aloft, maidens clothed in white strewing flowers, and the priest of each community at its head, came singing hymns, or telling Aves and Paternosters on their rosaries, in regular columns. The whole Rhenish provinces, the districts on the Moselle, the cities of Cologne, Coblenz, Metz, Nancy, Verdun, Aix-la-Chapelle, Luxemburg, Spires, Limburg, Munster, Osna-burg, towns and districts in France, Belgium, and Holland, all poured their population in a continued stream of pilgrims, moving on and on, without break or halt, towards the minster-tower from which a white banner with a red cross was waving above the dense cloud of dust and the dark mass of human beings. From the 18th of August to the 27th, at mid-day, 112,224 persons, according to the police lists, had come into Trèves, not reckoning the multitudes who came in and went

out the same day, without stopping the night. As the resort increased, from 1500 to 1700 pilgrims every hour in the day and night were reckoned to be passing through the city. From the 18th of August to the 14th of September, 600,000 pilgrims were reckoned to have entered within its walls. A Trèves newspaper of the 7th of October, the last day of the exhibition, reckons the numbers of pilgrims who had visited the holy relic, up to that date, at 1,100,000 persons. Others estimate the numbers at 1,500,000, and even at 1,600,000. Any correct statement of such a vast body as must have passed through Trèves within these eight weeks cannot be expected. The numbers, like those of the first Crusaders, struck the local authorities into dumb surprise; and many of the devout may have repeated their visits to the shrine over and over, and thus have swelled the apparent mass of pilgrims.

It does honour to the arrangements of Bishop Arnoldi, and of the clergy and municipality of Trèves, that, with this vast and sudden afflux of people, there were few or no accidents, few or no deaths from exposure to weather, fatigue, or want of food, and even no extraordinary rise of price in the markets for ordinary provisions. This fact

was clearly proved by the Catholic newspapers, in repelling the forebodings and imputations of the Protestant press at the time ; and this fact is, perhaps, the most serious, and, politically considered, gives occasion to the most serious reflections of any connected with the movement. There was a concentration of physical force within eight weeks in a given spot of a kingdom under autocratic military rule, which it would have puzzled a Napoleon or a Wellington to have drawn together, and compared to which, be the numbers ever so much exaggerated, the standing armies of any government, the two or three hundred thousand men of any army, are but a drop in the torrent. It shows the irresistible force of a whole people in movement. It repeats the lesson to monarchs which the French revolution told in France ; the resistance of the Caucasian tribes is telling to Russia ; the resistance of the Arab tribes to France ; O'Connell, and his monster meetings, to England ; and which all history tells, in every page — that the will of the people is the master power in society, which may be guided, but cannot be extinguished.

The loss of time in the precious season of harvest—and the sacrifice must have been heavy to the great mass of the pilgrims consisting of hus-

bandmen and their families—some instances also of persons who had mortgaged and even sold their tenements and little spots of land, to raise money to defray the expense of their pilgrimage; the openly avowed object also of drawing money to the cathedral, and to the city of Trèves, by the offerings from the pilgrims at the shrine, and by the necessary expense of their subsistence in the town—both together estimated to have exceeded a million of dollars—were the chief subjects of reprobation in the local German newspapers adverse to the movement: but these smaller discussions were cut short in the middle by a miracle—a real miracle, worked by the holy coat! What would the relic and the movement have been without a miracle?

The Countess Droste-Vischering, a young lady of one of the first families in those parts, and of the highest personal character—the family and the young lady well known to be of a probity and respectability that placed them beyond all suspicion of intentional connivance at any deceitful statement—had been afflicted for several years with a contraction of the knee-joint, so that the leg was at a right angle with the thigh-bone, and she had for some seasons been using the baths of Bieberich and of Kreuznach without effect. The

young lady had a lively hope that she would be cured of her lameness by the holy relic at Trèves. She went there, in this hope, from the baths of Kreuznach. Her lameness was such that she had to be carried out of the inn at Trèves to the shrine of the relic: she was instantly healed of her lameness by the virtue of the holy coat; was so entirely cured, on the spot, that she laid aside her crutches at the shrine, in testimony of her cure, and walked down the marble steps of the altar, and through the cathedral, and down the street to her inn, the Red House at Trèves, without other help than the arm of her grandmother, who had attended her on her pilgrimage. She returned to Kreuznach, complaining indeed of some pain, but, to the astonishment of all who knew her, able to do without crutches, although requiring some assistance in moving about. The young Countess and her grandmother are of a character beyond all suspicion of wilful connivance at any kind of deception. The long previous lameness of the young lady was known to all, and her sudden recovery was now visible to all. Here then is a miracle! a well-attested miracle, performed by the holy relic, the identical garment of our Saviour, which the woman with the issue of blood touched in the crowd and was

healed, and in the authenticity and miraculous powers of which a million and a half of the most educated of the German people, the Prussian population, believe in this nineteenth century! This well-attested, undeniable cure at the shrine of the holy coat at Trèves would have been the most bouncing of modern miracles but for the doctors. Those doctors will neither allow their patients to be cured by a miracle, nor without one. A doctor at Kreuznach, a little town on the Rhine with mineral waters reputed good in scrofulous cases, writes thus concerning the miraculous cure:—“Kreuznach, 5th October, 1844. I was not the physician who attended the young Countess; it was my colleague, Dr. Prieger. What I have to state, however, is partly from my own observation, partly from conversation with the young lady herself and her grandmother, and partly from the accounts of persons who are in almost daily communication with both of them.”

“The young Countess is an interesting girl, with an expression of suffering in her countenance, quiet, silent, and altogether a stranger to any kind of vanity or love of display. Her grandmother is a worthy, humane, amiable old lady; and both are so pure-minded, that no shadow of suspicion of any intention to deceive can come near them.

Before her journey to Trèves, the young lady could only come down the stairs into the saloon of the baths with the help of crutches, and that with difficulty. On her return from Trèves, I congratulated her on her being able to do without crutches; without, however, touching upon the mode of her cure; and she told me how happy she felt now, at being able, after three years, again to touch the ground with her foot, and to move about in her chamber, at least, without help. Out of her room, she said, she still required support, as her knee still pained her, and she would now continue her cure at the baths as before prescribed."

"From ladies who knew her intimately, and saw her often, it was understood that a gathering of blood had formed on her knee-joint."

"While she remained here after her return from Trèves, her leg did not become worse, nor did a new contraction of it take place; but where the tendons had been ruptured, an inflammation had ensued, which was however but temporary, and did not affect the result obtained at Trèves."

"The family of Droste-Vischering would have saved themselves from much vexatious remark in the public papers, if they had allowed the case to be simply investigated, and the mode and cause

of the supposed cure to have been inquired into and stated. They would never have represented it as a miraculous effect of a firm religious faith; but to give up the cure as the work of a power proceeding from the tunic at Trèves, might at that particular time have been a very serious step. The matter of fact is this: The young lady had been suffering for three years from a scrofulous swelling in the knee, for which she had been at the baths of Kreuznach for the third season. As usual in such cases, a shortening of the tendons in the knee-joint had ensued, in consequence of which the leg was drawn into a right angle with the thigh. The young lady was impressed with the conviction that her cure would be effected at Trèves. In a religious ecstasy, prostrate before the altar in fervent prayer, this conviction of the working of a higher power in her behalf gave a powerful exertion or convulsive effort in the diseased leg, the tendons were ruptured (from which came the subsequent inflammation and gathering of blood), and the limb became instantly straightened, so that she can walk, but not without pain. The operation of dividing the sinews, which is done in such cases without pain, was here done by a powerful effort; just as in former times, before

the operation of dividing the sinews was practised, the effect was produced by the force of a machine. The young lady, to the astonishment of all the guests at the bath, came out of her carriage, and walked up stairs without crutches, and merely supported by a servant. In an hour I was asked a dozen times, on my visits to my patients, 'Have you heard of the miracle?' With the Catholics it remains a miracle. Among Protestants doubts and suspicions arise."

"Certain it is, the Countess obtained at Trèves what she did not obtain at the baths—the straightening of her limb. But if she had had a blind confidence in her physician, and if he had possessed such power over her mind as to force her to make a strong effort to stretch out her leg, he would have performed the miracle.

"The cure of the scrofulous swelling of the knee was what was sought for, from the use of the waters here, after her return from Trèves. She left this place on the 14th of September, and I have not heard that, since she was here, her ailment is worse, or that any new contraction of the leg has ensued."

This, among a vast number of accounts—assertions and contradictions of the facts of the case—given by Catholic and Anti-Catholic parties, in

pamphlets and newspapers, appears to be the most calm, impartial, and sensible.

It is a miracle. The perfect faith evinced by the extraordinary and excruciating effort of stretching out a contracted limb with such energy, and no doubt agony of pain, as actually to snap asunder the contracted sinews,—and that faith, not in a rough uneducated mind, worked up into a sudden paroxysm, a delirium of superstition or passion, to an almost super-human bodily strength, and energy of will for a moment,—but in a delicate female of the higher educated class, and in which faith in the relic, all her family, her class, and a million and a half besides of the population of Germany partake, in this nineteenth century, is unquestionably as miraculous as the miracle of the cure itself. It is a miracle worked on mind*,

* Would a miracle be less of a miracle if it were operated on mind instead of matter,—on the percipient instead of on the object perceived? Many of the objections and difficulties to the belief in some of the miracles would be got rid of if this view of the operation of miracles were consonant with Scripture and reason. The miracle, for instance, of the sun standing still at the command of Joshua (Joshua, x. 12, 13.), viz. the diurnal revolution of the earth on its axis being suspended, is often objected to, as incompatible with the laws on which the existence of the planetary system depends, and that such a suspension of the laws of gravity and motion in our planet would have produced

not on a diseased leg. It has its application too, and its use. It is humiliating to the pride of educated civilised society ; it shows how little we can boast of any real and general progress of man towards a higher religious and intellectual condition, when this takes place, in the nineteenth century, within sight of the city of Bonn, in whose university every branch of human knowledge is cultivated, and taught by able professors ; where history, philosophy, theology, are worthily represented by men of talent and learning ; and in a land too in which even the very lowest classes have enjoyed the benefit of education, and have been drummed and drilled into knowledge at state-schools for a quarter of a century.

the most complete physical change in this world, while the cause of this divine manifestation of power could be known only to the very small portion of the human race fighting at Gibeon against the Amorites. But the miracle would not be less a miracle if operated on them, instead of on the solar system—if to them, and in their perceptions, the sun stood still, and they were made percipients of noon-day light at the natural hour of midnight darkness. In reasoning it is not wise or allowable to take the most difficult instead of the most easy solution of a difficulty, when the solution involves no dereliction of the character of the subject. The miraculous character of the event is surely as great, operating direct on the intellectual element in man, as operating on the material external world to be perceived by the intellectual element in man.

While the German newspapers and their correspondents were discussing, asserting, or denying the authenticity of the Holy Coat, and the miracle worked by it, and were brawling about all points except those of real importance in this mighty religious demonstration of a million and a half of people, a cry came from the East, which, like the roar of the lion in the desert, silenced all voices of inferior note. It electrified modern Germany.

In Number 164 of the Sachsische Vaterlands Blätter appeared “The Judgment of a Catholic Priest, Mr. Johannes Ronge, on the Holy Coat of Trèves.” It was dated the 1st of October at Laurahütte, and signed Johannes Ronge, Catholic priest. Where Laurahütte — that is, the Laura Foundry — is situated, was known to few. It is an iron-foundry in Upper Silesia, near the Russian frontier. Who this bold man, Johannes Ronge, was — he is a bold man who dares to publish his opinion on any passing public event in Prussia with his name to it — was known to fewer. This obscurity, the manly boldness with which it was thrown aside as a cloak of concealment, and the rude, pithy, Luther-like sense and style of the address, instantly roused the attention of all Germany. This piece was reprinted, and circulated by thousands. No writing for many years has

raised so general a sensation. The following is a translation:—

“The Judgment of a Catholic Priest, Mr. Johannes Ronge, on the Holy Coat of Trèves.

“Laurahütte, 1 October, 1844.

“What for a time sounded in our ears like a fable or gossip, that Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves was exhibiting a piece of clothing, called Christ’s Coat, to religious veneration, ye have already heard, ye Christians of the nineteenth century—ye already know, ye German men—ye already know, ye teachers of the people in religion, to be no fable, no gossip, but the actual reality and fact. For already, by the last accounts, five hundred thousand people have gone in pilgrimage to this relic, and daily other thousands are streaming to it, especially since the said piece of clothing has healed the sick, and worked miracles. The report has penetrated through the lands of all people, and in France the clergy have asserted ‘that they possess the true coat of Christ, and the one of Trèves is spurious.’ Truly the words are here applicable ‘that he who does not lose his

understanding at some things, must have none to lose.'

" Five hundred thousand people, five hundred thousand sensible Germans, have already gone to Trèves, to venerate or behold a piece of clothing ! The most of these thousands too from the lowest class of people, in great poverty, oppressed, ignorant, stupified, superstitious, and in part corrupted; and now they lay aside the cultivation of their fields, withdraw themselves from their trades, the care of their house affairs, the education of their children, to travel in pilgrimage to Trèves to an idolatrous festival, to an unworthy spectacle played off by the Roman hierarchy ! Yes ! an idolatrous festival it is ; for many thousands of the credulous multitude will be led astray to give those feelings of veneration which we owe to God alone, to a piece of clothing, a thing made by the hands of man.

" And what are the consequences of these pilgrimages ? Thousands of the pilgrims spend their money on the expenses of the journey, and on the offering they must present to the Holy Coat, that is, to the clergy. They scrape it together with loss, and even by begging, and return home to starve, to pine away, or to be laid down in sickness by the hardships of their journey.

If these external evils are great, very great, the moral evils are still greater. Will not many, brought to want by the expenses of their journey, seek relief by improper ways? Will not wives and daughters lose their purity of heart, their chastity, their reputation, and thereby ruin the peace, happiness, and well-being of their families? This altogether unchristian spectacle, in short, opens the door to superstition — to the supposed holiness of things earthly, to fanaticism, and to what is bound up with these, to vice. This is the blessing diffused by the exhibition of the Holy Coat, and it is altogether the same whether it be genuine or spurious. And the man who has presented this piece of clothing, a work of human hands, to public view and veneration — who has led astray the religious feelings of the credulous, ignorant, or suffering multitude — who has given an impulse to superstition, and thereby to vice — who has drawn their money and substance from the hungering people — who has made the German people a derision to other nations — who has drawn together still more strongly the thunder-clouds already rolling dark and fearful enough over our heads — this man is a bishop, a German bishop; it is Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves.

“ Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves, I turn myself to

you, and, by authority of my office and calling as a Catholic priest, as a teacher of the German people, I demand of you, in the name of Christianity, of the German nation, and of their teachers, to put an end to this unchristian spectacle, this exhibition of the Holy Coat, to withdraw from the public eye this piece of clothing, and not to increase a scandal already too great.

“ For do you not know—as bishop you must know it—that the Founder of the Christian religion bequeathed to his apostles and disciples, not his coat, but his Spirit ? His coat, Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves, belongs to his executioners.

“ Know you not—as bishop you must know it—that Christ taught ‘ God is a spirit, and he who worships him must worship him in spirit and in truth ? ’ And he is to be worshipped every where, and not merely in Jerusalem in the Temple, or on the mount Garizim, or at Trèves, before the Holy Coat.

“ Know you not—as bishop you must know it—that the Scriptures expressly forbid the worship of any likenesses, or of any relics ? that the Christians of the apostolic times, and for three hundred years after the Apostles, tolerated no relics (and surely they could have had enough of them), and no images, in their churches ?—that the worship

of images and relics is heathenish, and the fathers in the first three hundred years derided the heathens on this very account? For instance, it is said (Div. Inst. II. c. 2.) ‘the images, if they had life, should rather worship the men that made them, than the men them.’—*Nec intelligunt homines ineptissimi quod si sentire simulacra et moveri possent, adoratura hominem fuissent à quo expolita.*

“ Finally, do you not know—as bishop you must know it—that the sound strong sense of the German people was first debased to the worship of relics in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries by the Crusades, when the high impression it had of the Godhead before was obscured by all sorts of fables and miracle stories brought from the East?

“ Look you, Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves! You know all this, as well and probably better than I can tell it you. You know too the consequences which the idolatrous veneration of relics, and superstition in general, have brought upon us; namely, the spiritual and intellectual slavery of Germany; and yet you set up your relics to be publicly adored! But even if you did not know all this, and if you had only the good of Christianity in view in exhibiting the relics of Trèves, you have then a double guilt upon your conscience, from which you cannot clear yourself.

For, in the first place, it is unpardonable in you, if you knew that the aforesaid piece of clothing had the power of healing, to have kept it up from suffering man until the year 1844. In the next place, it is unpardonable that you take money for it, in offerings from the hundreds of thousands of pilgrims. Or is it not unpardonable that you, a bishop, take money from the starving poor of the population, although but a few weeks before you saw that want had driven hundreds of them to insurrection, and a desperate death? But do not suffer yourself to be deceived by the concourse of hundreds of thousands. Believe me, that while hundreds of thousands of Germans, full of enthusiasm, are hastening to Trèves, millions, like myself, are filled with horror and the bitterest detestation of your unworthy exhibition. These feelings are not confined to one class or one party, but are felt by all classes, and even by the Catholic priesthood. Judgment will overtake you sooner than you expect. Already the historian's pen is consigning your name, Arnoldi, to the contempt of the present and future generations, as the Tetzel of the nineteenth century.

“ But you, my German fellow-citizens, whether you dwell near to or far from Trèves, turn yourselves with all might to shake off this scandal on

the German name. Ye have town municipalities, parish overseers, district and provincial representatives. Well! work through these. Strive every man with might, and to his utmost, to oppose and restrain the tyrannical power of the Roman hierarchy. It is not at Trèves alone that this trade in the remission of sins is driven. Ye know, that east and west, north and south, rosary-money, mass-money, remission-money, burial-money, and the like, is gathered in, and that spiritual darkness is spreading and gaining the upper hand over all. Go all, Catholics and Protestants, to the work, for it concerns our honour, our liberty, and our well-being. Do not bring to shame the spirit of your forefathers, who razed the Capitol, by suffering the Castle of St. Angelo in Germany. Let not the laurels of Huss, Hutte, Luther, be disgraced! Give words to your thoughts, and deeds to your will.

“Finally my professional brethren who have the welfare of your flocks, and the honour, freedom, and happiness of the German nation, in your hearts and in your endeavours, be silent no longer, for you are sinning against religion, your country, and your calling, if you remain silent longer, and delay to bear testimony to your convictions by your doings. I have addressed you separately,

so that I shall only add a few words to you here. Show yourselves to be true disciples of Him who offered up all for truth, light, and freedom. Show that you have inherited his Spirit, not merely his coat.

(Signed) "JOHANNES RONGE,

"Catholic Priest.

There is true eloquence here,—genuine thunder. The nineteenth century has found its Luther. Will its Luther find followers and support?

This is a very weighty political question. A momentous crisis has very unexpectedly occurred—a break in the clouds of a black thunder-storm, through which the sunshine suddenly pours light upon the earth, and cheers the heart of the way-faring man. How much depends upon, how much is more or less closely connected with the success, permanent establishment, and future growth of this German Catholic church! How much, in the political, social, and religious condition of future generations in every civilised land, is wrapped up in this little paper of Johannes Ronge—is hanging upon the movement it has given rise to! A German-Catholic church distinct from the Roman, or, as it is now called by

Ronge's followers, the Italian-Catholic church ! Then why not an American-Catholic church, a Spanish-Catholic church, a Belgian-Catholic church, nay, an Irish-Catholic church—it would be worth half a crown to Queen Victoria—a “Catholicism without the Pope;” in short, in every Catholic land, a church, without any connection with the Roman hierarchy, returning to what the church was before the bishop of Rome had any supremacy over the clergy of other countries ? All this, and more of what is of greater importance to the social well-being of the people than the political changes it may produce in their governments, may be connected with this movement. All the interference of the church of Rome with mixed marriages, which has afflicted domestic life of late years so severely on the Continent—that is, the demand of the Roman Catholic priests, that the children of a marriage of a Catholic and a Protestant shall be brought up in the Catholic faith ; otherwise, absolution, the sacraments, the death-bed and burial services, and all other church privileges, shall be denied to the Catholic parent—falls at once to the ground. The German-Catholic church is an asylum from such persecution. The disputes on this question,

in which the Prussian Government was involved with the Court of Rome, through the bishops of Cologne and Posen, are terminated at once by this voluntary renunciation of the power of the Pope and his priests in matters spiritual or temporal, by the Catholic clergy and population of Germany, or by any such considerable body of the enlightened influential men among them as will constitute a Catholic church independent of Rome, purified, as far as each congregation may think fit, from the errors and abuses of the church of Rome, and having a clergy elected by the congregation from the priests who have seceded with them — a national clergy, requiring no ordination from or communication with Rome. The secret power, real or imaginary, ascribed to the Order of Jesuits in modern society falls at once to the ground, with the machinery through which alone they could act on society,—a priesthood dependent on Rome, and holding the religious education of the people in their hands. The other social evils, too, of the Roman Catholic church fall at once to the ground: the state of slavery and debasement of mind in which the inferior clergy are educated and held; the immorality produced by the forced celibacy of the clergy: the auricular confession of wives and maidens on the most secret immodest

circumstances and subjects, on which a wife would not talk to her husband, or a girl to her own mother, in the shameless, open, and descriptive way which the duty of the confessional imposes on the priest and the female, side by side, in the confessional box, and which is exposed by Ronge, Czerki, and other Roman Catholic priests who have given in their adhesion to the new Catholic church, as an immoral, degrading, unchristian abuse, and the chief among the causes on account of which they separate themselves from the church of Rome ; — all these abuses fall to the ground.

The abuse and immorality of the auricular confession, and its effect, even when not abused, to break the confidence and sacredness of communication in married life, and, even between Catholics, to give, in fact, a spiritual husband to the weak-minded female, as well as her worldly spouse, are felt, in our times of delicate and refined ideas, as destructive of domestic happiness. If the auricular confession was in the days of Luther felt to be unsuitable to the manners and spirit of that age, it is an abuse of itself sufficient to produce a second reformation, in our more intellectual and refined nineteenth century.

This movement is, in fact, in all its circumstances, very similar to that which Martin Luther

headed in the sixteenth century. Then, it was an obscure monk, opposing the sale of indulgences and remissions of sin in the fairs and market-places, to the people, by the Pope's agent Tetzel, that struck the spark which enlightened himself at last, and with him the Christian world. Now, it is an obscure Catholic priest, teacher of a school at an iron-foundry in Silesia, — a man, to judge from his style of thought and expression, very like Luther in strong sense, rude eloquence, and determined energy of character, opposing the same abuses, and exposing another Tetzel, in the Bishop of Trèves, to the descendants of the same people. Will he have the same success ?

This event is either to prove the most important that has risen on the political horizon of Europe since the Reformation, to be a second reformation, and a fatal blow to the power and stability of that church which survived even the storm of the French revolution, and gathered vigour from the winds that shook her ; or it is to stand, in the future history of these times, a clear proof that the religious element in the mind of the German population upon which in the sixteenth century the Protestant church was built, is extinct now, in the nineteenth century. Its success or its failure are

as yet in the womb of time. In either case it will be an important elucidation of the present state of a great and enlightened portion of the European people,— of the social, intellectual, and religious condition of the public mind on the Continent. In this view, every fact, and opinion formed on the spot from the facts, is of some historical importance. This importance must be the excuse for repetitions, contradictions, and imperfect conflicting opinions in this statement. This German-Catholic church is not a *fait accompli*, but an event in formation and progress ; the facts concerning it have to be collected from a mass of pamphlets, and accounts in the small country journals and newspapers, in which the circumstances are differently represented according to the local prejudices of the circles in which they circulate, or of the writers. The great leading journal of Germany, the “Allgemeine Zeitung,” which is equivalent to the “Times” in England, and which perhaps alone could give the “form and pressure” of the public mind in Germany truly upon this subject, is published in Augsburg, in the Bavarian dominions, and the newspapers in Bavaria are interdicted from even mentioning the name of the German-Catholic church. It is

therefore upon the swarm of country minor newspapers that the inquirer is thrown for picking out his facts and opinions, and they are truly legion. This must be the excuse for what may be found inconsistent, contradictory, or groundless in the following remarks.

II.

JOHANNES RONGE published at the same time, viz., in October, 1844, an “Address to the Catholic Teachers,” alluded to in “The Judgment of a Catholic Priest on the Holy Coat at Trèves” translated in the preceding chapter; also an “Address to the Lower Catholic Priesthood,” and an “Address to my Fellow-believers and Fellow-citizens;” and in December, 1844, his “Justification.” The three first-mentioned addresses are exhortations to throw off the degrading yoke of the Roman hierarchy, and of the upper clergy appointed from Rome — to renounce the servility, superstition, abasement of mind and body, in which pupils, teachers, and the lower order of priests are held by the discipline of the Roman Catholic church — to renounce the Pope, auricular confession, celibacy, and all the immoral and irreligious abuses, introduced without any Scriptural warrant, in the dark ages, merely for the support of the Papal power — to take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, for the rule of religious life — and to establish an Apostolic Catholic church

— a church such as the Christian church was in the time of the Apostles, and for three hundred years after them — in which there is no Pope or papal power — in which the clergy are chosen by their elders and congregations, from suitably educated men, and mutually ordained and inducted by their fellow-clergy — and in which the service shall be in a known tongue, the German, not in the unknown Latin language — the sacrament of the Lord's Supper dispensed to the laity, as well as the clergy, in both elements, the wine as well as the bread — the fees for masses, burial-services, and other rites, together with pilgrimages, fasts, saint-worship, relic-worship, abolished — each congregation retaining as much of the ceremonial service, mass, and liturgy of the Roman Catholic church as it finds suitable, until a general council of the new German-Catholic church be convened, in which the several congregations will take part. These are the principal points referred to in these addresses, and in the numerous letters, paragraphs, proposals, articles, in which the subject of the German-Catholic church is discussed through the provincial newspaper press.

Germany has not, like England or France, a centre from which political or literary intelligence is diffused through the country, and that intelli-

gence the better the nearer to the source. The periodical press of the capital cities — as of Berlin, Munich, Dresden — are the nearest to the censor's bureau ; and if his scissors are not visible, the fear of him is, and its sheets are far behind those of the provincial small-town press in freedom of discussion and intelligence. They, from their local circulation, may escape notice, and insert discussions which would bring the newspaper editor in the great city under the infliction of the law. The restraint upon the liberty of the press in Prussia is the most absurd and ineffective exertion of arbitrary power in modern times. Intelligence, like quicksilver, slips out between the fingers, while the censor tries to hide it in his hand. Conversation cannot be stopped. The intelligence gets out with all the obnoxious comments upon it ; and what the censor in the capital, under the eye of the court, may think very unsuitable to appear in a newspaper, the censor at Breslau, Cologne, or Dantzig, in the same kingdom, may not observe to be objectionable at all ; and out of the Prussian dominions it assuredly gets printed, in some little town journal, and circulates widely among the very classes from whom the government wished to keep it — the middle and lower classes who take their intelligence from cheap local

papers. Political news or discussions are at any rate of small interest in Germany, because the German powers—Prussia, Bavaria, Wirtemburg, Hanover—are shut out by nature, in times of peace, from any political influence. What could these powers say to Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Egypt, or any American State? Their recognition or non-recognition of the governments of these countries, or approval or disapproval of their acts, are empty forms of diplomacy. There is no political weight and no real interest in the foreign relations of those states, and therefore the public mind is thrown back upon petty domestic politics and theoretical discussions. The affairs of their theatres, the marriages, births, journeys of every petty prince—the matters of no importance or influence, and therefore of no interest, in our state of society, to the reading public, and which we would call gossip, rather than news—occupy the public mind. The minds even of their rulers are narrowed by the limited sphere of really important affairs in which they have to work; and they carry on a fidgetty governing in small things; a busy bustling interference in petty parish details; a galloping from end to end of their dominions, to see what their personal seeing is altogether absurd and useless; and a mixing themselves up, in no very

dignified way, in personal opposition to political writers and their works. The censorship of the press, the persecution of many authors, whose only claim to be read is that their books have been prohibited, the system of passports, the military system, the educational system, the system of interference in all operations of industry and capital, are in reality the workings of a government that has nothing to do, no other sphere to work in, and which must be doing something to satisfy its own self-importance. A continental king in these times is very like an English gentleman at his country-seat during the recess of Parliament, who, although detesting public business, for which he perhaps is unfit, feels the want of excitement, the having nothing to do of any importance, and from mere *ennui* and idleness bustles about in his stable, kitchen, and garden, as head groom, cook, and gardener in one; sits in solemn committee upon a gravel walk to his greenhouse, as if it were the London and York railroad; and torments every body, and interrupts all work, in his endeavours to have something to do, and to gratify his self-importance. Many of the domestic events which astonish us with our notions of royal dignity and kingly office — such as the personal displeasure of the Prussian monarch at two private gentlemen of

Baden, members of its States, or Parliament, who are leaders of the liberal party in it, and ordering them instantly out of his dominions, although provided with regular passports — may be accounted for as the natural consequences of the royal position, without real weight abroad in the world's affairs, and with nothing to do at home but the business it can make for itself, and without even an opposition in its home-affairs to carry a point against. This want of really important affairs, and of freedom to discuss what they have, will account for the speculative spirit of the German journals. It is not what is, but what may be, that they discuss — and the further from reasonable probability in these speculative views, the further from risk of censorship. This church movement came on so unexpectedly, and at first under the shape of discussions upon the antiquity of the holy coat of Trèves, the reality of the miraculous cure of the young lady, the numbers of pilgrims, and such subjects as governments jealous of political discussions rather encouraged than repressed, that its objects and opinions were spread over Germany by the country newspaper press before the governments had time to consider it. The subject was exactly suited to the state of the public mind and the public press in

Germany: plenty of speculation on what may be growing under it; no necessity to discuss what is; great room for antiquarian research and abstract opinions, without approaching too near to matters prohibited. The idea too of a German Catholic church, a national church, a nationality in all things, is fashionable. The governments of some of the Protestant states, as of Wirtemburg, and of Prussia itself, were probably not very averse, even after they had considered it, to allow the demonstration against the Papal authority and hierarchy to go on, and to check the assumption of power in their dominions over marriages and education, by showing that there was a resistance among the Catholics themselves, which, if fostered by government, would annul the Papal pretensions, and become a second Reformation. These considerations perhaps, and the impossibility of suppressing by censorship what the public is determined to know, prevented any general interference with the circulation of Ronge's publications, and of hundreds on the same side.

The "Justification" was a reply by Ronge to a multitude of slanderous articles which had appeared, in all the Roman Catholic newspapers, on his character and conduct. He was stated to be a suspended priest — suspended for im-

moral conduct from the functions of priest by the chapter of the cathedral of Breslau, in January, 1843. The "Justification" is a simple account of his life.

He was born on the 16th of October, 1813, at Bischofswalde, a village in the circle of Neissen in Silesia. He was the third child of his parents, who had a family of ten children, and a small croft, or peasant estate, on which their labour supported them. From his sixth to his twelfth year, he kept the sheep, and his elder brothers helped to work the arable land. He was taught, at the village school, to read, write, and cipher; got the Catechism by heart, and Bible history, while attending his sheep in the field; and learnt geography and the history of Silesia the last year he was at school. One of the teachers persuaded his father to send him to the Gymnasium at Neissen, in the year 1827, and he remained there until 1836. Ronge adopted the clerical profession, as most suitable to his own pious disposition and love of giving instruction, and also to his father's circumstances, who had eight other children to provide for. He performed his military duty of three years' service while at the Gymnasium, in the years 1837, 1838, and 1839; and in December 1839, entered the Priest-Seminary. The

training of the young priest * — the crushing all thought, feeling, devotion, and knowledge, into a repetition of the same and the same forms — the reducing the human mind to a ceremonial machine — the five hours daily of the same Latin prayers — the silence, the idleness of mind, the want of communication with, and consequent hypocrisy

* The following account of the day's occupation in a priest-seminary gives the best view of the formation of the mind and habits of the young men studying for the Roman Catholic priesthood : —

Morning, 5½	to 6 o'clock,	morning prayer.
6	to 7 . . .	breviary prayers.
7	to 7½ . . .	mass.
7½	to 8 . . .	breakfast.
8	to 10 . . .	lectures.
10	to 10¾ . .	free.
10¾	to 11½ . .	study.
11½	to 12 . .	breviary prayers.

Before and after dinner prayers in the chapel for about three quarters of an hour together, and afterwards from a quarter to half an hour of breviary prayers.

Afternoon, 2	to 4 o'clock,	lectures.
4	to 4¾ . .	free.
4¾	to 7 . .	study.

After supper about half an hour of prayers in the chapel, and one hour of breviary prayers.

The prayers are always in Latin ; and on Sundays and holidays are more frequent. At meals the pupils must not speak. Twice a week they are allowed to go out. They sleep from three to fifteen in one room, and have one room for about 20 pupils to study in.

towards, each other of the inmates — the degrading treatment from the superiors — are touched upon as having lowered him morally in his own estimation ; and when he left the seminary, as a priest, the finding himself cut off as it were, by his profession, from his former free communications with his parents, and brothers, and sisters — and the meeting an old man, who used to fondle him when a child, who now reverentially kissed his hand, when he was going to shake hands with him — this separation from the common sympathies of our nature, by the conventional standing of the priest, are slightly but feelingly touched upon, and disclose, no doubt, the real feelings of many a young Roman Catholic clergyman, living in the world as a thing not of it, walking about in the crowd of human beings, not in the pride of a superior, but in the desolation and agony of heart of an isolated outcast. He was appointed to the cure of Grottkau in 1841, as preacher and school-master, or chaplain. The chapter of the Breslau cathedral, of which Grottkau was a chaplaincy, was then, in consequence of the vacancy of the see, presided over by Dr. Ritter, the vicar-general of the diocese, an ultramontane divine, who was endeavouring to bring back the darkness of the middle ages in the schools and in the pulpits

under his control. Ronge opposed this retrogression; taught and preached in the most enlightened strain permitted in other Catholic countries; and in an article in the “*Vaterlandsblätter*” of the year 1842, intitled “*Rome and the Chapter of the Cathedral of Breslau*,” and signed “*A Chaplain*,” which attracted much notice, exposed the attempts to bring back the superstitions and usages of the dark ages. For this he was called to account, and suspended by a decree of the chapter, in February, 1843; and he repaired to Laurahütte, as chaplain, and teacher of the school in the ironfoundry. So far from any moral delinquency being imputed, or being imputable to him, the whole inhabitants of Grottkau, and of Laurahütte, signed a testimonial of his irreproachable moral and religious conduct, and of their regret at losing him as their teacher and pastor; and even those who were absent at the time joined in sending their signatures afterwards to this testimonial. This “*Justification*” silenced at once all the false accusations of the purity and consistency of Ronge’s clerical life; and they recoiled with the more force on the heads of his accusers.

All Germany rang with this case, and the principles it unfolded. Ronge was degraded and

excommunicated by the chapter of Breslau. Robert Blum of Leipsic, a man known in the literary world, a friend, if we mistake not, of the poet Schiller, took up his defence. Dr. Regenbrecht, a member of the chapter of Breslau, and professor of canon law in the Breslau University, wrote to Dr. Latussek, the vicar-general, or bishop *pro tempore* of the see, that “ he renounced the Roman Catholic church, as he could not reconcile its attempts with the spirit of Jesus.”

In the mean time several families at Schneidemühl, a small town in the circle of Posen in Prussian Poland, united themselves under their priest, Czerzki, renounced the Roman Catholic church, and took the name of the Christian Catholic, or Christian-Apostolic-Catholic Congregation; and applied, by a petition, dated 27th October, 1844, to the departmental government at Bromberg, to be acknowledged, regulated, and established according to law in their external affairs. No new sect or congregation is recognised in law, in the Prussian dominions, without the sanction of government. The new congregation likewise sent to the functionary government at Bromberg their confession of faith, and published it at the same time out of Prussia, at Stuttgart, under the title of “ Public Confession of Faith

of the Christian-Apostolic-Catholic Congregation at Schneidemühl, as to their Difference of Tenets from the Roman Catholic Church, that is, the Hierarchy: published by Köhler, Stuttgart, 1844, for the benefit of the congregation." At the same time appeared, "A Justification of my Renunciation of the head Church of Rome," by Czerzki, the priest of this congregation. This appears to have been the first organised congregation of the new church.

In Breslau, a number of Roman Catholics united and formed a congregation, under Ronge himself. In Berlin, Magdeburg, Elberfeld, and in all the chief towns of Prussia, in Dresden, Leipsic, in Offenbach, in Worms, Kreuznach, Weisbaden, meetings were held, and congregations formed, almost simultaneously. Catholic priests of note and standing, such as Pastor Licht, an old man, much respected, and Pastor Kerbler, gave in their adhesion to the new church; merchants and independent tradesmen joined it; but many of the middle class, especially those who are in function under government, or are expectant on function, civil or military, for their children or friends,—and these constitute a large proportion of the middle or upper classes,—stand aloof until the will of the government be made known. This is not a

very lively or promising kind of zeal in religious convictions, that waits upon the permission of the government to believe or express belief. That this reason should be given and received as valid, in adopting or rejecting a religious faith, appears to us, accustomed to civil and religious liberty, very extraordinary. It is a circumstance very characteristic of the social condition of Germany in the present age, of the abject servility of the public mind in Germany in all political, civil, and religious concerns, produced by the system of functionarism, state education, and military duty. By these the people are kept in a state of mental pupilage, like the bodily vassalage under the nobles and land-owners before the French revolution.

The spread of this schism from the Roman church, its extent, appears to be as yet confined to the towns or cities, where, by trade, manufactures, and acquired wealth, there are people of the middle class independent of functionarism, or government favour. Silesia, where it began, has long been a manufacturing country, although its linen manufacture is now in a very depressed state, owing to the competition in the American markets, and now in the Chinese, to which the Silesian linens were formerly sent, to a considerable amount, through Russia, from the British linen manufac-

ture. Elberfeld, and all the towns in the Rhine provinces in which it has been openly embraced, are seats of considerable manufactures; and Leipsic, Dresden, Berlin, Breslau, are cities of such magnitude, that a considerable body of individuals have a living in them independent of government function. It is in these localities, and among this class, that the new German-Catholic church has found favour. The very highest and the very lowest classes, and the country population, appear not at all to have adopted it. The million and a half of pilgrims to Treves, composed entirely of those classes, show that it has not extended to them; that on the contrary, the current of effective religious zeal is running altogether in an opposite direction, and in favour of the most gross superstitions of the Roman Catholic church.

The schism is, however, extending itself daily, and making rapid progress among those of the middle class whose circumstances and social position allow them to adopt it. Every newspaper has accounts of new meetings, or new congregations being formed, and of individuals giving in their adhesion to it, whose respectability keeps others in countenance. Marriages have been solemnised in it at Breslau, Berlin, Elberfeld, Leipsic — among others, Czerzki, the Roman Catholic priest of

Schneidemühl, has evinced the sincerity of his renunciation of the errors of the Roman Catholic church, by taking upon himself the yoke of matrimony. Baptisms have been performed. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper has been dispensed in both elements to the laity. In two or three towns in which the property of the churches happens to be vested in the municipality, or in the parishioners, the use of the Protestant church has been given to the new congregations. In others, warehouses or other large buildings have been converted into temporary churches. At Offenbach, near Frankfort, the petty government of Anhalt-Dessau prohibited the use of the church being given to the new congregation on the eve of its first meeting. A rich merchant lent his warehouse, the tradesmen of the place gave their work and material, and on Sunday the church was ready, and the service and sermon, by Pastor Licht, an aged Roman Catholic priest, who has joined the new church, were so effective, that a congregation was immediately formed in the adjacent very important city of Frankfort. Meetings, addresses, even subscriptions of money, although very sparingly, compared to the efforts of any Scotch parish in raising pecuniary means for its spiritual objects, are every where on foot. In England, according to

report, the German Roman Catholics are about forming a German-Catholic church. The actual number of congregations established on the principles of the Christian-Catholic or German-Catholic church is supposed to be, in the month of May, above one hundred; but of these many have not, as yet, settled ministers. Considering the slow movement of life in Germany, the want of communications, and the novelty of any exercise at all, by the people themselves, of civil or religious rights without the sanction of government, this progress and extent of a schism which has only been in existence about eight months is not discouraging.

III.

THE principles, doctrines, or confessions of faith of the congregations of the German-Catholic church, in what they differ from, and in what they agree with, the Roman Catholic church, on the one hand, or with the German Protestant church on the other, have to be examined, before any reasonable conjecture can be made on its ultimate success or failure. If founded on sound, consistent, distinct principles of religious doctrine and church service, it will succeed ; if not, it will fail, and be merged in one or other of the churches on either hand of it, the Lutheran or the Roman Catholic.

The congregations which started up simultaneously in the most distant parts of Germany, at the call of Johannes Ronge, had no time to communicate with each other, and adjust common points of faith. The repudiation of the Pope and hierarchy of the Roman church, of its errors, idolatrous observances, and superstitions, and the establishment, in place of it, of a pure Apostolic-Christian-Catholic church, such as the Christian

church may have been in the days of the Apostles, and for three hundred years after them, was a common point of union, but it left something — a great deal indeed — vague, and to be defined by each congregation according to its own views and feeling of what is error, and superstition, — what is observance idolatrous, or unscriptural — what is observance innocent, venerable, useful, and to be retained. To renounce more or less of the doctrine and service of the Roman Catholic church was a common principle in all ; but how much to renounce, how much to retain, depended, no doubt, on the spiritual condition of each congregation. At first, therefore, each congregation, when it was formed, drew up a confession of faith for itself, and an enumeration of the points of doctrine or observance on which it dissented and differed from Roman Catholicism. Other congregations, finding their religious views in accordance with one or other of these published confessions, adopted that which suited them, with or without alteration. It is understood that these are but temporary, or at least are not unchangeable confessions of faith, and adoptions of ritual services. A general council of the German-Catholic church, in which the several congregations are by their ministers, elders, or representatives

to take part, will be held at some future period, for adjusting the various confessions of faith and rituals, for drawing up a catechism, a liturgy, a system of religious instruction, and such essential matters. In the mean time, the leading confessions of faith, and declarations, of dissent from the church of Rome, which have been published and most generally adopted by the new congregations, are very widely different from each other in doctrine, and in what they retain or renounce of Roman Catholic superstition, in belief, and in ceremonial. To reconcile them, to bring them under one church, one religious body of doctrine, appears a work impossible for any council to accomplish, because principles totally discordant, and incompatible with each other, are involved in the different points of doctrine, faith, and ceremonial retained by some and renounced by others of these congregations.

The following are the leading confessions of faith, or articles of belief, and articles of dissent from the church of Rome, which have hitherto appeared, and have been adopted as a type by other subsequent congregations. All the congregations have adopted one or other of the following confessions and declarations. To reduce them to one, common to all, and acceptable to all,

will be the very difficult problem for the proposed council of the German-Catholic church.

The earliest in date, and which is referred to by many subsequently formed congregations as the confession of faith which they adopt, is the confession of faith, and articles of dissent from the Church of Rome, of the congregation of Schneidemühl, of which its former Roman Catholic priest, Czerzki, is now the pastor.

“ Schneidemühl, 19th October, 1844.

I.

“ WE believe in one God, the almighty Father, creator of heaven and earth.

II.

“ We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, who from all eternity was begotten of the Father, and is God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not created, of equal nature and being with the Father, and through whom all was created, who for our sakes, and the salvation of man, descended from heaven, and by the Holy Ghost from the Virgin Mary assumed flesh, and became man; who also was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered, and was buried, but on the third day, according to

Scripture, arose again, and ascended into heaven, where he sits at the right hand of God, and from whence he shall again come down in glory to judge the living and the dead. This his kingdom will have no end.

III.

“ We believe in the Holy Ghost the Lord, who giveth life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who is to be praised and adored with the Father and the Son: who spoke through the Prophets. We believe in the holy general (catholic) apostolic church. We acknowledge a baptism to the forgiveness of sins, and await a resurrection and a life in the future world. Amen.

IV.

“ We receive the Holy Scriptures as the only sure source of Christian faith, and that in the sense in which they are intelligible to every enlightened pious Christian.

V.

“ We acknowledge that by Jesus Christ our Lord seven true and proper means of grace (sacraments) are established under the new covenant,

namely — 1st. Baptism. 2d. Confirmation (the laying on of hands with prayer). 3d. The holy Supper of the Lord. 4th. The penitence. 5th. The priestly ordination (the laying on of hands with prayer). 6th. Marriage. 7th. The preparation for death (extreme unction); — and that these impart pardon; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and the ordination to the priesthood, cannot be repeated without sacrilege.

VI.

“ We acknowledge that the commemoration of the bloody offering on the cross of Jesus Christ, which is celebrated in the holy Mass, may be of service to the dead and the living; that in all the holy altar-sacraments, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, with his soul and godhead, truly, actually, and in substance, are present, and that the whole substance of the bread is changed into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood, through faith.

VII.

“ We acknowledge that priests not only may receive the sacrament of marriage; but, to be worthy examples to the people, they ought, according to the holy Scriptures, to receive it.

VIII.

“ We acknowledge that the holding divine service, and in general the administration of sacraments in a foreign tongue, is contrary to Scripture; and that therefore the language known to the congregation ought to be used in divine service, and in administration of sacraments.

IX.

“ We acknowledge that the holy sacrament of the Lord’s Supper ought absolutely to be received in both elements, and that the receiving the sacrament under one element only is not sufficient for salvation.

X.

“ A purgatory, such as taught by the Roman hierarchy, there is not; but there is ‘in the house of our Heavenly Father many mansions,’ like steps towards beholding God. We acknowledge that these steps must be gone through by those who have not made themselves fully worthy here on earth to behold God; and that on this ground our prayers may be serviceable to the dead; but,

XI.

“ We acknowledge and firmly believe that

Christ alone is the Head of his church, and his vicegerent here on earth is the Holy Ghost.

XII.

“In this true general belief, expressed through Jesus Christ, we, here present, acknowledge ourselves freely, and sincerely promise, vow, and swear to preserve it, with the help of God, uninjured and unadulterated, to the end of our lives, with unbroken steadfastness; and also to apply all possible care that this belief shall be taught, made known to, and held by those under us, or intrusted to our charge. So help us God and his holy Scriptures.

“Accepted at Schneidemühl, the 19th October, 1844.”

(Signed, &c.)

The next in date is the declaration of faith of the congregation of Kreuznach, a little town on the Rhine, frequented for its minerals waters, and the witness to the miraculous cure of the young Countess Droste-Vischering. The Protestant reader will not fail to observe, that the nearer to the Rhine, and to independence in the means of living, the bolder and more determined the language of the new congregations.

“Kreuznach, 10th February, 1845.

“WE, the undersigned, have resolved, from free choice and inward conviction, to establish a Catholic-Christian church unfettered by all human additions and deformities, pure in the spirit of the founder of our holy religion. The rock upon which this church is built stands on the ground of the sublime passage in the Scripture,

‘Love God above all, and thy neighbour as thyself.’

“We consider, therefore, as abuses, through the work of man, and reject, in all time coming — 1st. The authority of the Pope as head of our church. 2d. Celibacy. 3d. Auricular Confession. 4th. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper in one element, and Transubstantiation. 5th. The Exorcism at the baptism of infants. 6th. The prayers to the Saints. 7th. The veneration of pictures, and relics, and also pilgrimages. 8th. The Confirmation. 9th. The extreme Unction. 10th. The Latin tongue in divine service. 11th. The nonsense of Remissions. 12th. The doctrine of Purgatory.

I.

“We acknowledge only one mediator between God and man, namely, our Saviour Jesus Christ.

II.

“ We retain the Mass, after it is altered to the spirit of the Christian-Catholic church.

III.

“ We acknowledge only two sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord’s Supper.

IV.

“ We consider the latter as a remembrance, or memorial feast, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and receive it under the words, ‘This represents, or shews forth, my body ; this represents, or shews forth, my blood.’

V.

“ We bind ourselves to provide for the wants of our church and school, until the State has settled our concerns. Each will contribute to the good cause according to his power and good will. Other resolutions remain over for our common consideration, when the congregation has constituted itself, and obtained a suitable minister. And so may the Spirit of Love, Truth, and Light penetrate and animate this Christian-Catholic church, and guide, direct, and rule all her internal and external affairs.

“ Kreuznach, 10th February, 1845.”

(The signatures.)

The declaration of faith, and articles of dissent from the Roman church, adopted at Breslau, at the same date nearly, viz., between the 11th and 16th February, are important, as proceeding from the capital of Silesia, in which the movement had its origin, and as showing the kind and order of the church service in the new church, approved of in that city, at divine worship, and followed by most of the congregations elsewhere. Breslau has been distinguished, although a stronghold of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, for much more energy and boldness in demanding the constitution promised to the people in 1814, than any of the other great towns of the Prussian monarchy; and from the vigour with which the city of Breslau urged these rights and promises on the accession of the present monarch, stands in no great favour at Court, and is at the head of the independent party in Germany. Its declaration, therefore, is of weight in other places. .

“ Breslau, 16th February, 1845.

I.

“ WE declare ourselves free from the Roman bishop, and his hangers on.

II.

“ We assert full freedom of conscience, and detest all compulsion, lies, and hypocrisy.

III.

“ The foundation and the structure of Christian faith is the holy Scripture.

IV.

“ Its free examination, and exposition, no authority ought to restrain.

V.

“ As the substantial contents of our religious belief, we present the following form of it:—

I believe in God the Father, who by his almighty word created the world, and rules it in wisdom, justice, and love.

I believe in Jesus Christ, our Saviour, who by his teaching, his life, and his death, redeemed us from sin and slavery.

I believe in the working of the Holy Ghost on earth, in a holy general Christian church, forgiveness of sins, and life everlasting.
Amen.

VI.

“ We acknowledge only two sacraments as ap-

pointed by Christ:— 1st. Baptism. 2d. The Lord's Supper.

VII.

“ We retain the baptism of infants, receiving them, after sufficient education in religion, by a solemn admission, as self-acting members of our congregation.

VIII.

“ The Lord's Supper will be administered, after consecration to Christ, in both elements, to the congregation. The congregation receives it as a commemorative feast of the sufferings and death of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Auri-cular confession is rejected.

IX.

“ We acknowledge marriage to be an appoint-
ment of God, and therefore holy for man; and
we retain the church ceremony of marriage. In
relation to conditions or impediments to marriages,
we acknowledge only the laws of the land as
binding.

X.

“ We believe and acknowledge that Christ is
the only mediator between God and man. We
reject, therefore, the invocation of saints, the

veneration of pictures and relics, the remissions, and pilgrimages.

XI.

“ We believe that the so-called good works have only a value in so far as they proceed from a Christian spirit. We reject, therefore, all fasts.

XII.

“ We believe, and acknowledge, that it is the first duty of a Christian to show his faith through works of a Christian spirit.

XIII.

“ The essential parts of divine service consist in teaching and edification. The Mass will be celebrated in the language of the country, and according to the practice of the oldest churches, modified with a regard to the wants of the age. The participation of the congregation, and the mutual working between them and the minister, is considered an essential demand in divine service.

XIV.

“ The divine service of the church, the Agenda, or, How the proceedings shall go on before the assembled congregation, for their edification, consists in the following pieces, spoken and sung:—

1. The commencing hymn.
2. General Confession of Sin. (Confiteor.)
3. 'Lord have mercy upon us.' (Kyrie.)
4. The song of praise, 'Glory be to God in the highest.' (Gloria.)
5. The prayers of the Collect.
6. The Epistle.
7. The Gospel.
8. The Sermon, with the usual prayers; and before and after the Sermon, a verse of a hymn.
9. The Confession of Faith.
10. A passage selected from the Passion, at the consecration of the holy Supper of our Lord, instead of the canon of the Mass.
11. The hymn, 'Holy! Holy! Holy.' (Sanctus.) During the communion the congregation sing the hymn, 'O Lamb of God,' &c. (Agnus Dei.)
12. The Lord's Prayer.
13. Concluding song of the congregation.
14. The Blessing.

XV.

"Besides this head service, in the afternoon will be catechising, or edifying discourses.

XVI.

"We observe no festivals, or holidays, but those ordered by the law of the land.

XVII.

“ The foundation of a church constitution is the congregational constitution, according to the example of the primitive church of Christ.

XVIII.

“ At the head of the congregation is the minister, and elders elected yearly at Whitsunday.

XIX.

“ The minister is chosen by the congregation, and inducted by a solemn act into his office. The election can only be from divines who produce testimonials of their theological knowledge and unblemished character. The order for the celibacy of the clergy is annulled.

XX.

“ For the present, what is wanted to support the minister, and carry on divine service, will be defrayed by the members of the congregation, each contributing according to his means.

XXI.

“ All services of religion will be performed equally by the minister for every member of the

congregation ; and all fees, or payments for such services, are abolished.

XXII.

“ The reception of new members into the congregation takes place by acknowledging the confession of faith before the elders and minister.

XXIII.

“ Members joining the congregation from religious societies not of the Christian faith, must first be admitted to baptism, after due instruction in Christianity.”

The declaration and articles of faith, and of dissent from the Roman church, adopted at Leipsic, is an important document ; as Leipsic, if not itself the chief seat of the literature of Germany, is the centre of the material interests of literature ; and it has been drawn up apparently in concurrence with that of Breslau, and at the same date.

“ Leipsic, 12th February, 1845.

“ IN the name of God the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,—

“ We, the undersigned, declare hereby openly

and solemnly, before God and men, that we acknowledge no longer the authority of the Pope at Rome in matters of belief.

“ We declare ourselves solemnly free, from this day, from Rome and the Pope, and establish an Independent German-Catholic Congregation ; and adopt as our own the annexed Confession of Faith of the German-Catholic Congregation at Breslau, until a General Council, elected by all the members of the German-Catholic churches, shall have settled a Confession.

“ We assume the approbation of the higher state authorities will be given to this step taken according to our convictions and consciences, and to obtain which, the necessary measures will be used by our elders.

“ CONFESSION OF FAITH.

I.

“ We renounce the Pope, and declare ourselves free from the hierarchy.

II.

“ We abolish auricular confession also.

III.

“ We abolish the use of the Latin tongue in divine service.

IV.

“ We abolish celibacy, as not founded on the Holy Scriptures, but appointed by the Pope solely for upholding the hierarchy.

V.

“ Marriage is declared a holy ordinance, and the benediction of the church is held to be necessary thereto. For the rest, no other limitations on marriage but those fixed by the law of the land are acknowledged.

VI.

“ We abolish all hitherto existing church practices by which remissions, fasts, pilgrimages lead to a nonsensical sanctification of works.

VII.

“ The Lord’s Supper, as it is established by Christ, will be taken by the Congregation in both elements.

VIII.

“ The Congregation acknowledges but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, because in those only is Christ undoubtedly present, according to the testimony of Scripture.

IX.

“ Baptism is the sign of being received into the Christian bond; and is performed on infants with the understanding that at years of discretion they will confirm, by confession of faith, their baptism.

X.

“ The Lord’s Supper serves for a remembrance of Christ, and a token of the brotherly bond between all.

XI.

“ The grounds of the Christian belief shall be only and solely the Holy Scriptures, and reason penetrated and moved by the idea of Christianity. The Congregation adopts the Apostolic Confession of Faith as theirs, and places it as the object of the church and of individuals to come to a living acknowledgment of the same, suitable to their temporal convictions. In the different explanations and understandings of its meaning, the Congregation finds no ground for separation and condemnation.

“ SPECIAL PROVISIONS.

XII.

“ The Congregation makes use again of its old rights to elect freely its minister and elders.

XIII.

“ Every minister will be introduced to his congregation and office by a solemn act; but in this every thing will be avoided that can recall the sacramental meaning of the Roman consecration to priesthood, or could serve as a foundation for hierarchy.

XIV.

“ The Congregation understands it to be the chief problem of Christianity, not only to bring to a lively conviction by instruction, teaching, and divine service, its members, but also, by active Christian love, to promote with all their power the spiritual, moral, and material interests of their fellow men without distinction.

XV.

“ The external forms of divine service shall always be regulated by the wants of the time and place.

XVI.

“ The reception into the Congregation, after it is fully constituted, will take place, upon a declaration of willingness to join it and acceptance of the Confession of Faith, by the elders making it known to the Congregation.

XVII.

“The Liturgy, and the part of the divine service belonging to edification, shall, according to the practice of the Apostles and first Christians, be adapted to the wants of the times.

XVIII.

“The external usages in worship in the church are left to each member; only what leads to superstition is forbidden. The holy or festival days appointed by the State are alone observed.

XIX.

“The congregational constitution follows the model of the Apostles and early Christians, but necessarily altered to suit the circumstances of the times. The Congregation is represented by its minister, and chosen elders elected yearly at Whitsunday.

XX.

“All church duties, as baptisms, marriages, burials, will be performed by the minister equally for every member, without fees.

XXI.

“For the sake of unanimity, all those provisions,

and also the Confession of Faith, shall be subject to the determination of a general German Council, and are therefore only to be considered as *pro tempore*.

“CONCLUSION.

“All these provisions are not settled for all time coming, but may be altered by the Congregation according to the conviction of the times.”

(Signatures.)

Elberfeld, a town of very considerable importance in the cotton manufactures, is situated near Dusseldorf, in the midst of the population which rushed in pilgrimage to Trèves. Its declaration is dated the 15th of February, 1845.

“IN the name of God the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“We, the undersigned burgesses of Elberfeld, belonged hitherto to the Roman Catholic church, and as members of it have long seen, with increasing distinctness, the greatness of the errors and abuses which adhere to her inmost principles, and have taken the upper hand altogether in her latest movements. The more we endeavoured to know

and understand the pure teaching of Jesus, and to ground our faith on the Gospel, the only spring of Revelation, the more deeply were we penetrated by the conviction, that He, Christ, is the only mediator between God and man; that the doctrine of the Pope, of an infallible church, of the religious use of saints and relics, is not founded on the Word of God, and weakens the merits of our Saviour; that the ideas of the Roman church on the Lord's Supper, on the priesthood, and on its position with respect to the laity, are false, and rob the believers of their most precious privileges. The clearer these convictions by degrees became, the heavier we felt the chains in which we were bound to a church of which the most important doctrines could not be reconciled by us to the Gospel; and the heavier we felt it to have a belief which we could not openly acknowledge, and to have no divine service answerable to our religious wants. A light suddenly arose out of this darkness which was growing deeper and deeper, and a day-dawn of hope announced the goodness of God to us. Circumstances which we need not mention have brought the joyful certainty, that the day is near, and brings light and liberty to the captive. What was struggling in us is come to clear conviction, and we thank God that we

know what we want, and that He has given us the courage freely to declare the belief we acknowledge.

“In the sight of God we abjure the Pope, and the hierarchy, and all the non-evangelical matters thereunto belonging. Whatever struggles or slanders may assail us, we cast ourselves loose from them. We cast ourselves loose, not to go to war with men of another belief, not even of that belief which we renounce, but to find peace to our souls, and to thank, and serve in joy, God our Lord. We cast ourselves loose, not in pride or from a craving for a false liberty. We embrace, with our brethren in Schneidemühl, the crucified Jesus, whose pure precepts alone, whose kingdom alone, whose honour and worship alone we seek and wish. Amen.

“While we thus constitute ourselves into a Christian-Catholic-Apostolic Congregation, we solemnly declare that we adopt the Confession of Faith of our sister church (Schneidemühl) in all essential points.”

This Confession is then quoted verbatim, and the declaration is signed with a strong expression of the firm resolution of the subscribing members to abide by and support their principles.

Offenbach appears not to have formed a congregation until May, but adopted a series of resolutions as a foundation for a Declaration of Faith, similar to that of Breslau, on the 20th February. This declaration requires —

I.

“Free reading of the Scriptures, and in the translations not sanctioned by Rome.

II.

“Abolition of fasts by church appointment.

III.

“Abolition of the invocation and veneration of saints and relics.

IV.

“Abolition of the unintelligible and unprofitable in the service; and above all, of the Latin tongue.

V.

“The Lord’s Supper in both elements, which by historical right acknowledged by the Popes themselves, the so-called laity are entitled to, and which would place the priest in his proper position.

VI.

“Abolition of auricular confession, and its effects — without however restraining the free communication and confidence of individuals of a congregation in their minister.

VII.

“Abolition of remissions, as an unworthy trading with the highest spiritual blessing.

VIII.

“Abolition of the impious and inhuman church laws against the members of other confessions of faith, particularly respecting mixed marriages, and godfathers and godmothers.

IX.

“Abolition of the forced celibacy of the clergy, on the grounds of humanity, of the history of the church, and of the efficiency of the clergy themselves in the clerical office.

X.

“Complete abolition of dependence on the Roman Pope, as the chief cause of every evil.”

The declaration and articles of dissent from the Roman church, by the congregation of Worms, is dated 8th March, 1845.

“ WE, the subscribers, declare —

I.

“ We remain as before — Catholics.

II.

“ As such, we remain members of the congregations of our respective parishes ; and we adopt, consequently, the doctrines or dogmas of the Catholic church, as articles of faith. But, in the course of time, abuses have crept in, which we do not consider as belonging to the Catholic church. We protest, therefore —

I.

“ Against all restraint in reading the Holy Scriptures in translations not approved of by the church.

II.

“ Against church fasts.

III.

“ Against the veneration of saints and relics, and against pilgrimages and processions.

IV.

“ Against the use of a foreign tongue in performing divine service. We require, namely, the German language to be used in the holy mass.

V.

“ Against administering the sacrament of the Holy Supper in one element only.

VI.

“ Against auricular confession.

VII.

“ Against all remissions of sins by the church.

VIII.

“ Against the doctrine that the Roman Catholic church is alone the church of salvation, which is contrary to the doctrine of love towards our fellow men, and out of which arises the proceedings in cases of mixed marriages.

IX.

“ Against the continuance of celibacy.

X.

“ Against the supremacy of the Pope in the Catholic church.

XI.

“ Against the introduction of the new catechism of Mayence.”

This congregation refers to the declaration of that of Offenbach, as expressing the opinions it adopts.

The declaration of the congregation of Dresden, adopting the Breslau confession, is dated the 22d of February, 1845; that of Unna, the 25th of February; that of Hilderschien, the 2d of March; both adopting the Schneidemühl confession; that of Wiesbaden the 8th of March. These are essentially the same in the declarations of faith, and in the articles of dissent from Rome, as in those given above; and their simultaneous appearance in the most obscure and most important localities, distant from each other, and even under different governments, and all holding the same language, stating the same articles of dissent or of spiritual grievances, and expressing the same intentions—show that there is a common feeling in all upon

the subject. The dates show that they could not have been formed upon one nominal model, although the coincidence of the points stated in each is so remarkable.

The declaration of the congregation of Berlin is dated the 3d of March, 1845. It is of importance, as expressing the opinions of a congregation in the intellectual metropolis of Germany, and under the eye of a government jealous of every movement of mind among the people it professes to educate and enlighten. It is as follows:—

I.

“WE take the Holy Scriptures as the truest source of Christian faith, and accept the oral delivery of it only in so far as it agrees with the Scriptures.

II.

“We hold the belief in Christ to be the foundation of our justification, and honour works only in so far as they flow from faith.

III.

“We acknowledge only two sacraments as being ordained by Christ, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. The other sacraments of the Roman Catholic

church, therefore, we acknowledge as only pious usages, consecrated by tradition.

IV.

“ We reject, however, the doctrine of transubstantiation ; that is, the change of the substances of bread and wine into the substances of the body and blood of Christ. We acknowledge, however, that we partake of the substances in the real spiritual presence of the Saviour.

V.

“ We partake in the Holy Supper of the Lord in the two elements ; but admit the partaking of it in the bread alone.

VI.

“ We retain the holy mass, as a memorial of the bloody offering on the cross of Jesus Christ ; but only in the language of the country.

VII.

“ We reject the ordinance of auricular confession ; but respect the voluntary acknowledgment of guilt to the minister of the congregation.

VIII.

“ We deny the belief that the priest has the power to remit sins, and reject the imposition of express penances; but respect the pious mediation between the confessing and the minister.

IX.

“ We reject forced celibacy, and also the making of monastic vows against marriage; but respect the voluntary abstaining from marriage in so far as a conscientious discharge of the duty of the party requires it. We require, for the validity of marriage, the celebration in church by a priest.

X.

“ We admit the celebration of marriages between Christians of different confessions of faith.

XI

“ We reject pilgrimages and remissions; but we acknowledge the utility of the veneration of saints, and respect their human remains, but we do not address or invoke them, but expect from God alone our salvation, through Christ our only Mediator.

XII.

“ We reject the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church concerning purgatory ; but admit a purification of the soul after death.

XIII.

“ We acknowledge Christ alone as the Head of his church, and the Holy Ghost as his substitute on earth.

XIV.

“ We declare ourselves free from the Pope and his priesthood, and do not acknowledge him as the head of the church, appointed by God.”

IV.

AT the first view of this mass of declarations, or confessions of faith, and of articles of dissent from Rome, put forth simultaneously by upwards of a hundred congregations of the most enlightened of the Roman Catholic population of Germany, adopted not merely by the congregations, but by the most respectable Roman Catholic priests and professors, and all expressing the same and condescending upon the same grounds of separation, as if by common consent; and at the view of the adherence of new members of the highest character and estimation in the middle and upper classes, the formation of new congregations going on so rapidly that the country newspapers are filled with little else, and the estimates of the extent and progress of this movement to-day fall short of the reality to-morrow, we naturally feel the joyful anticipation that we are on the eve of another great Reformation, like that of Luther and Calvin, that the downfall of the church of Rome is sealed and certain, and that a new church of pure Christian faith, a new era of Christianity, is rising in

the very same land in which light first dawned upon the darkness of the middle ages. A more careful study of those documents abates our hopes. These confessions of faith, and declarations of dissent from the Roman church, coincide wonderfully in abjuring and rejecting the same errors, and in expressing and adopting the same very true, but very vague, principle of universal love of God and our fellow men, of faith in Christ, and of the example of the Apostles and Christians of the apostolic age being the true basis of a new Christian-catholic, Apostolic-catholic, or German-catholic church; but when we come nearer to this general flag under which all denominations of Christians may be arrayed, we find that the special differences of doctrine, upon which each church, or sect of Christians, had in old times set up its own peculiar banner under this general flag, and taken the field against its neighbours, have not been removed or levelled. One word or name, such as the Apostolic-christian church, or Christian-catholic church, or German-catholic Church, or the Christian world, or Jack, Tom, or Will, may cover a multitude of individuals and a multiplicity of opinions altogether discordant, and these may be grouped into distinct congregations, or churches, hating each other as religiously as

they can ; but this is only a picture of Christianity as it stands,—it is no amalgamation of Christians into one body of one faith, into one church. It is but a kind of religious freemasonry, covering all opinions because it has none of its own. It is only by avoiding, not by embracing and inculcating doctrine, that this vague generalisation can be made the universal or Catholic-christian church.

There is a double meaning in the word Church, which produces much confusion of ideas in every Christian country. We are told in most of the above documents, and are often told so at home from our own pulpits, that Christ left no church on earth but the living church of faith and conviction in the hearts of true believers. Now this is true, in the meaning that Christ left no Pope with his cardinals and Vatican, no Archbishop of Canterbury with his surplice and liturgy, no Kirk of Scotland with its General Assembly and patrons, no church establishment, in short, or state church with its machinery, and with power either spiritual or temporal. But it is not true in the meaning that Christ left no body of doctrine, or dogmas, constituting a church. It is the doctrine, not the machinery, not the Establishment or its power or shape, that is the essential, the soul of a church, that is, *the Church*. What in

the other meaning is called the Church is but its clothing. Now, Christianity is the most dogmatical of all religions. It would be nothing if it were not; for a doctrine cannot be true and false also. “Thou shalt have no other Gods but me,” is the earliest and most positive of dogmas, admitting no other doctrine or religion. A whole church, an exclusive church, was existing in these words: and while the Romans admitted the Persian, Egyptian, Scythian, and all other forms of idolatry into denizenship with their own mythology, they persecuted the Jews and Christians for their religion, because they had a church, that is, a positive exclusive doctrine, admitting no fellowship, or co-existence of any other worship. The other nations had only a religion, but no church; that is, no doctrine but what was so vague that any other form of idolatry might be included under it—just as under the vague generalisations laid down in these documents as the basis of a general (Catholic) Christian church, any kind of doctrine, true or false, would be covered. It was because Christianity had a church, that is, a body of positive doctrine for the mind to lay hold of, excluding all other either vague or precise ideas of religion, that it spread in the early ages, when the mythology opposed to it had nothing positive and ex-

clusive in doctrine, belief, or practice. It is because Popery has positive, distinct, material objects for the uncultivated mind to lay hold of—such as the holy coat of Trèves, crucifixions, pictures, relics, and a doctrine concerning the efficacy of such things suited to the understanding of the uncultivated — that it spreads more rapidly, and excites more zeal than pure religion can do until the public mind has attained a higher state than the social condition of the German people — the mental vassalage in which they are held — allows it to reach ; even with the school education so generally diffused among them. True religion is founded on true civil liberty ; that is, on the free use and exercise of mind in all individual action. It can live in no other soil. The double meaning of the word Church has led the new German congregations into propositions and conclusions in these documents, which are not scripturally correct. It is true that the church in one meaning, viz. as a worldly establishment, with a Pope, with spiritual and temporal power, with superstitious usages and errors not warranted by Scripture, is not of Christ's institution, and it may be, and ought to be, abolished, or altered and adjusted to suit the wants of the times. But it is not true that the church, in its real scriptural meaning of

a body of doctrine delivered to man in the Gospels, can be altered or adjusted to suit the wants of the times. The doctrine delivered in the Scriptures is either true or false; and if true, it is unchangeable. For instance, the doctrine of transubstantiation is either true or false. It cannot be both true and false. If true, it cannot be altered to suit the taste or wants of the times. If false, it cannot be accepted as true doctrine, nor slurred over in a church to be called a Christian church. Now in what way, on what principles of truth, — not to speak of Christian truth but of common logical truth — can the doctrine of transubstantiation adopted and laid down in Article VI. of the declaration of Schneidemühl, to which the congregations of Elberfeld, Unna, Hildesheim, and others give their adhesion, as expressing their belief, be brought into one church, that is, into one body of scriptural doctrine received as truth, with the declarations of Breslau, Art. VIII., of Kreutznach, IV., or of Leipsic, X., and of the congregations adopting their declarations, in which the Lord's Supper is expressly stated to be a commemoration, remembrance, or token only of the crucifixion of our Saviour: or the two into one church or belief with the 4th Article of the Berlin declaration, which expressly, and *toti-*

dem verbis, rejects the doctrine of transubstantiation, and adopts a view neither Roman Catholic, Lutheran, nor Calvinistic, viz. the real presence of the Saviour, not *in* the elements, as held by Roman Catholics and Lutherans, either corporeally or mystically, but *at* the partaking of the elements, as a spectator, as it were, of the ceremony? One only of these *three* doctrines can be true. No general council of congregations of the new Christian-catholic church can bring these discordant doctrines into one church — can reduce such a discrepancy of belief to a common term, because such a church would be inconsistent with itself, would include doctrines true and false, and beliefs held true and false by its own members. It would be a church, that is, a body of doctrine, founded not on truths but on no-truths; and would do more harm than good to true Christianity, and true morality, for it would be a church of no faith at all, indifferent to the truth or falsehood of its own tenets and doctrines; and as a Christian church would be a monstrous religious lie. But no doubt a political or theolo-political structure, that is, the machinery of a church establishment different from the Roman Catholic, might be reared upon the foundations laid down in all these declarations, viz. upon the general and true prin-

ciples of love of God and of our fellow men, the rejection of the Papal power and hierarchy, and of its errors and superstitions ; and as a social arrangement such a structure might be a vast social and political improvement : but it would not be a Christian church, that is, a body of doctrine true, or held to be true, by all its members. If held out to mankind as a church, it would be of more harm than good, by confounding truth and falsehood in the human mind on that in which every mind seeks out the true from the false, and believes its own faith to be true ; for even the atheist believes his own opinions to be true. It would be a retrograde, not a forward step, to bring back the Christian world to the state in which it was during the Apostolic age, or the first three hundred years after those times ; because then, although Christianity was pure, and free from the errors and superstitions which the church of Rome has since engrafted on it, all but the chosen few were in a state of gross indifference and torpid apathy about all religious truth ; and all society, except the lowest class, had no religion at all. The enlightened, educated men of those ages laughed equally at all religions, and held even the immortality of the soul, and a future state of reward or punishment, as a mere pious delusion, useful politically, but not true.

There are dangers to true Christianity much greater than errors and superstition, and much more imminent in this age ; viz. total apathy, and indifference to all religion. The million and a half of pilgrims to the holy coat of Trèves went out to seek the bread. True, they got but a stone ; but it was bread they went to seek. The seeking was in them, and they are infinitely nearer the finding the true bread, than if they had been sitting at home in total mental indifference and perfect apathy about all spiritual or religious concerns. They had the spirit, although it was ill directed. The danger from a German-catholic church founded on no principle but the disregard of the true and the false in doctrine, would be the inducing of a disregard in the public mind of the true and the false in morals and religion ; an apathy about all religious truth and moral truth ; a state of society similar to the most vicious and degenerate of which history has given us any account, and to which the German-catholic church proposes to return, that of the Apostolic age.

It is singular that few of these declarations take any notice of one of the most fertile sources of the errors and superstitions of the church of Rome, — the doctrine of Purgatory. The De-

claration of Faith of Schneidemühl, Article X., specially rejects the belief in purgatory in the first clause of the sentence, but in the next clause adopts the belief of a purification or advancement of the soul hereafter, step by step, like the promotion of an under-officer in the Prussian land-wehr. This advance of the soul hereafter, from one mansion to another — from a lower to a higher stage of existence and happiness, is merely the doctrine of purgatory in finer words, and somewhat dressed out. Are these steps from a lower to a higher state to be gained by the merits of the dead themselves in those preparatory steps, states, or mansions of their future intermediate existence? Why, this is the Indian doctrine of the transmigration of souls into inferior animals, as a purification and punishment, until they acquire by merit a qualification to enter into a superior order of being; only the Schneidemühl doctrine is not quite so intelligible and reasonable as the Brahminical. If not by the future merits of the dead themselves, in some new, unknown, yet morally and religiously responsible state of future existence, it must be by the present merits of the living, by the prayers, masses, alms, penances in behalf of the dead by the living, that this advancement of the dead from state to state is to

be gained. There can be no third way, as none of the living have such an excess of merit, moral and religious, that they can spare some to their deceased neighbours. It can only be by their fastings, masses, and prayers. It is but a difference of words, not of doctrine, about a purgatory that we have here. In a poor ignorant village in Silesia, making its first effort to throw off the slough of superstition, this doctrine on the subject is excusable; but from the enlightened city of Berlin the world is entitled to expect something less childish, something more precise and fixed on the doctrine of purgatory, than the Article XII. of its Declaration. “We reject the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church concerning purgatory, but admit a purification of the soul (läuterung der seele) after death.” What is purgatory but a purification of the soul after death? The Berlin Declaration is a curious and characteristic specimen, altogether, of the courtly style of affirming and retracting (so as to give no offence to people in power) in religious belief. The first clause and the last of each Article are, like this one, in direct opposition and contradiction to each other. In the Articles on transubstantiation, on auricular confession, on saint and relic worship, the retraction or modification follows in breathless haste

the affirmation ventured upon, and in reality leaves the matter as it stood before. This is not root-and-branch work. It is but cutting down the stem and foliage of the weed that poisons the ground, leaving the root in the earth, to shoot up as vigorously as before. These declarations of faith and of articles of dissent from the church of Rome renounce saint worship, relic worship, penances, clerical celibacy, auricular confession, and yet retain the root of doctrine from which all these necessarily and reasonably, that is, logically and in reason, spring. It is the doctrine, — the premises, not the consequences or deductions from it, that are wrong. Admit the doctrine, and you cannot shut the door upon the consequences.

V.

ANOTHER weak point, not, indeed, exactly doctrinal, but seated in the natural constitution of the human mind rather than in the social or political state of Germany, will strike the reader who peruses attentively the mass of doctrine set forth in the above confessions of faith. They consist almost entirely of negative, not of positive doctrine — of the negation of erroneous dogmas of the church of Rome, rather than of the affirmation of other right dogmas. Now, there is truth in the negation and renunciation of error, as well as in the affirmation and adoption of truth. That is unquestionable. But if we attend to the natural action of mind, and to the experience of its movement which all history gives us, we find that in negative truth, if it may be so called, there is not the same living spirit of action as in positive truth. We discover and renounce error, each mind by itself and for itself, and there we sit individually and separately. We embrace a positive truth — it may be a gross error, but it is received as a positive truth — and we act together; we are a body embued

with common feeling, because one common process of mind, and not each thinking by and for himself, has brought all to the same point by the same way. Energy, enthusiasm, fanaticism, all active movement of mind, are connected, through that sympathy which spreads in crowds, with the class of positive truths received by all in one and the same way, much more than with the class of negative truths which each mind individually, and by a different way and process, according to its powers, receives, or works out by itself. We find in history, that every sect which has had any great zeal and duration, has dealt in positive ideas, whether errors or truths. Negation will not sustain a sect. The simple non-reception of doctrines will not burn up into a flame of active zeal, although it may passively endure to the utmost for the sake of truth. It wants the element of acting and spreading, like positive doctrine. The Deists or Unitarians have always languished as religious sects, because their denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, their negation of the divine nature of our Saviour, give no positive dogma for the mind to lay hold of. The Mormons flourish, because they not merely deny, but affirm, and give something positive, however absurd, to the vulgar mind. The Roman Catholic

church, with its Pope, its caste of priests devoted to celibacy, its relics, images, miracles, soul-saving penances and ceremonies, deals in positive ideas. The reform of Luther, Calvin, and John Knox would never have succeeded if these reformers had contented themselves with giving such simple negations of the errors, abuses, and superstitions of the Roman Catholic church as are contained in these declarations of faith of the new German Catholic Congregations. They gave positive doctrine against positive doctrine, went to the Bible for positive truths, not merely to the practices of the church of Rome for negative truths. In their confessions of faith — a circumstance very remarkable, and showing their sagacity, and deep insight into the human mind — they do not even refer to the church of Rome and her doctrines, or state how much of them they retain and how much they reject, but lay down their own doctrine in propositions positive for the mind to embrace.

It was an original contradiction, however, in Lutheranism, which Calvin in part, and John Knox altogether avoided, that it retained the forms of the church of Rome to a certain extent, while it rejected the principle on which they are founded. The cutting off from the forms of

ceremonial which it retained, the splendour and weight from external material means, to which, if they were well founded and good for any thing at all in religious worship, they were in correct reasoning entitled, has been a canker eating away Lutheranism from its birth. If altars, lighted candles, crucifixes, altar-pieces, surplices, &c. are retained, the principle of a holiness in things is retained; and the legitimate sequence, or deduction from what is retained, is image worship, and all the idolatry and splendour of the Church of Rome. It is the same admitted principle carried out to its legitimate extent. If the Mass, or the repetition of the same liturgical prayers, words, and printed forms of divine service, be true worship when performed once a week, it is impossible in sound reasoning to deny that they are true worship when performed every quarter of an hour, and the tale of the performances of this ceremonial worship kept upon a string of beads. If the altar, lighted candles, and crucifix be holy things, and something more than the work of human hands, something more than a stone cut by John Smith, or a pound of wax candles bought at the grocer's, or a piece of gilt wood made by the carver and gilder in the town, it is impossible to deny that they are entitled to all the bowings

and kneelings bestowed upon them. The Tractarian or Puseyite section of the Church of England, who hold doctrines on the sacraments, on the priestly ordination and office, on tradition, on the divine appointment of the church (that is, not merely of the body of doctrine contained in the Scripture, which is the church in its true sense, but of the body of clergy, which is the church in their sense), which are identical in principle with the doctrines of the Church of Rome, are bound, in honest reasoning, to adopt all that flows by sound and fair deduction from those doctrines, namely, all the ceremonial and usages of the Church of Rome. They all flow from the admitted doctrine of a holiness in things and in men. The wonder is not, that many Tractarians or Puseyites have openly gone over to the Church of Rome, but that any of them should want the honesty in their religious reasoning to do so.

It is the consequence of this inherent contradiction in Lutheranism, and of its false position, from retaining a ceremonial shorn of all that gives it weight in the sister Church of Rome, a material external splendour, and a spiritual internal meaning, that in every country the Lutheran church is dead. Its clergy and congregations are not imbued with that zeal and religious sentiment

which exist at this day so strongly in that branch of Calvinism which at the Reformation repudiated all ceremonial worship, the branch established by Knox in Scotland. The progress of mind in society, as in an individual, makes men reject the address to the senses, in matter of religion, through barbarous show and ceremony, and gradually makes all prefer what is addressed to their intelligence and reason. It is not improbable, therefore, that in Christianity there will be, at no very distant period, only two churches — the Presbyterian, the most simple, and opposed to all form and ceremonial worship — and the Church of Rome, in the extreme of superstitious usages. There is no half-way house in religion ; and that which Luther built is tumbling to pieces. The Lutheran clergy preach, no doubt, excellent sermons, but the sermons are to illustrate moral truths, common to all men of all religions. Scripture may or may not be referred to for an illustration of the moral truth ; but no Christian truth, unless in as far as all moral truth is Christian, is heard from the German pulpit. This torpid state of Lutheranism, as a Christian church, justifies the doubt whether the public mind in Germany be in a state to embrace with zeal this new German Catholic church, which approaches nearest to a

Lutheranism without episcopacy, or a kind of congregational Lutheranism. If the Lutheran church be dead, this cannot be very lively.

It is a peculiar feature of this religious movement, and one not very encouraging to the hope that it is to prove another reformation, that all the declarations of belief from the different congregations, as given above, may rather be called declarations of no belief; of no belief in certain errors, it is true; but they are not declarations of belief in certain Gospel truths. If there be no explicit recognition and adoption of Scriptural doctrine totally incompatible with the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome, it is doing nothing to renounce the errors and superstitions. It is doing worse than nothing, for it is leading men to hold principles, and renounce the legitimate consequences of the principles they hold, or else to leave doctrine and principle altogether behind in religion, and look only to the external practices. If purgatory, or a purification, step by step, of the soul in a future state, be true, then prayers for the dead, masses, intercession of saints, and all the superstitious practices built upon it, are the reasonable sequences of this doctrine, which cannot be rejected, if the doctrine be retained. If transubstantiation be true doctrine, then the

celibacy of the clergy, and their personally divine character as a consecrated body, are right and reasonable. It would be a monstrous desecration to imagine that the priest, who by his divine office was first transubstantiating, then handling, eating, and drinking in our behalf the *ipsissima corpora*, the very flesh and blood, of our Saviour, was a man just risen from the marriage bed — from the gratification, it might be, of animal concupiscence. Celibacy is a necessary sequence from transubstantiation in religious reasoning.

Religion is the great schoolmistress of nations. The mental faculties of a people are formed by her, and they who neglect her school generally turn out dunces, considered as a mass of people, with a few bright examples of superior genius shining among them. Much of the apathy of the German people about all social and political affairs may be traced to their apathy and indifference about religion. The difference of the intellectual culture of a people is manifested strongly in these confessions of faith of the middle educated class of the German Roman Catholics. We would probably not find three among them whose taste and judgment in the fine arts are not more highly cultivated than in any of the same class in Scotland ; yet we would scarcely find three ploughmen

or workmen in Scotland who could not draw out a much more soundly reasoned confession of faith than any of these, giving the principles and Scriptural grounds on which they reject or retain practices and doctrines, exercising judgment and knowledge in forming their opinions. The public mind with us is habitually exercised on higher intellectual, moral, and social interests ; and the cultivation of the public mind in Germany turns more upon subjects of taste, upon those which address themselves through the senses to the imagination.

It may reasonably be doubted if the public mind in Germany be in a state to embrace with zeal and to sustain a true church, that is, a body of pure Christian doctrine.

A very important social structure may, however, be raised by this movement. It will not be a true church, but it will have all the machinery of a true church, viz., congregations and a clergy formed on just principles of social economy. The congregations are voluntary ; they elect their pastors from suitably educated men ; they support them ; and they and their clergy acknowledge no connection with or control from the state. These are sound principles of social economy. Although not united by any common Christian doctrine, —

holding doctrines, in fact, which cannot be amalgamated,—they are united by these principles into one social body, which may check or even annihilate, in many localities, among the upper classes, the power of the Church of Rome and her priesthood. They may cut down the weeds, although not sowing any valuable crop in their stead. It is of importance, in the history of modern society, to trace this movement, and to estimate its prospects and chances of success. To estimate these, it is necessary to consider the social and political state of the people of Germany; to see how the different classes in the social body are connected with each other; and whether their way of living together in their social state produces a common feeling for common interests—a public spirit and union capable of supporting the new German-Catholic church.

VI.

ABOUT fifty years ago, before the French revolution roused the world from the dormant and abject state into which all society on the continent of Europe had fallen, the lowest class in the social body of Germany, the labouring country people, were *leibeigen*, that is, held in body- property. They belonged to the owner of the land on which they were born, were bought and sold with the estate, and were in law and in reality attached to the soil. They paid to the owner, or tacksman of the land, a certain number of days' work in the week, or a certain number of hours' work each day, and had to perform a number of services in extra work, when required. For their subsistence they had a patch of land allowed them, to produce rye for bread, and flax for clothing ; had grazing for a cow and a few sheep : and had turf or wood for fuel, and a dwelling. Time had settled, by long use and wont, the kind and amount of services and subsistence on each barony into a tacit law or right, which might be — but, from the nature of agricultural labour, which comes round

in a regular routine with the seasons, seldom was — very outrageously infringed. The master had the right to imprison his leibeigen vassals, and to flog them for neglect of work ; and had a prison, — the *hundsloch*, or doghole, it was called, — and a ground officer, or baillie, to execute his commands. The leibeigen had, however, a sort of protection from any gross ill-usage or oppression, in the justiciary who was appointed or approved of by government, and dwelt on each estate or barony, independent in some degree of the owner, although paid out of the estate, and who was always a man bred at an university to the profession of law, removeable only by government, and looking only to government, not to the baron, for his professional advancement. Above these local government officers was the *amtman* superintending a small circle of them, and receiving their official protocols of the proceedings before them. No bodily punishment, beyond a certain number of stripes, or three days' imprisonment in the black hole, could be inflicted without a regular sentence by the justiciary, subject to revisal by the *amtman*. The minister, also, living in the parish, or on the estate, if it was a considerable barony, and paid out of it, but independent of the owner after appointment to his living, was a

kind of moral check on very grievous tyranny. The influence of public opinion too, his character of being a hard and oppressive, or indulgent and good master, was felt even in this state of society. The great kindness and good nature inherent in the German character, also made very gross ill-usage of the serf the exception rather than the rule. In sickness, the landowner had to support his serf, and had to keep a doctor on his estate. The infirm, the aged, the widows, orphans, and, in case of bad crops, from weather, floods, or other calamities, the people themselves had to be subsisted by their proprietor. They could not change their residence, they could not go elsewhere to seek work for money-wages; but work elsewhere was not to be got, unless in the great towns. A leibeigen man found beyond the bounds of his barony without a written leave, or pass, was taken up and punished as a deserter. The system of passports did not arise, as some suppose, from the conscription and other circumstances in the French revolution, but only the extension of it to the higher classes. The thing itself is coeval with the feudal system. If the leibeigen escaped into one of the free towns, such as Hamburgh, Lubeck, Frankfort, he could not be reclaimed; and, after a year and a day, the city

gave him the right and protection of natives, even beyond her own walls, and against his former master. In the vicinity of Hamburgh and Lubeck, so late as 1795, the roads were patrolled by cavalry to prevent the escape of vassals from the estates in Holstein, into the territories of those cities. But at greater distances, the labour in husbandry, the only work to be got, or with which they were acquainted, was filled up by people in their own condition, and no work for wages was to be found. There was no temptation to change their condition, as the change would have been from servitude, indeed, but with bread, a home, and the common lot of all around them — to absolute starvation. So far from considering their condition of *leibeigenschaft* very miserable, there was great repugnance and opposition, rising almost to revolt among them, to its abolition in the territories in which it was most rigorous — in Holstein, and Schleswig, and other parts of the north of Germany. Labour is a kind of money in the two hands of the labouring man, and they saw no advantage, but the contrary, in changing this money into coin, to be paid to their masters for rent, and to make provision themselves for sickness, old age, their widows and infants, in case of death, and against bad crops and the like, when they

had the same land and subsistence, and a provision made for them against future wants and casualties, much more certain, by paying their labour direct to their masters. They were not, perhaps, so very wrong in their reasoning.

A class immediately above this *proletaire* class were peasants on the estate holding a little more land than was necessary for family subsistence, and paying a rent, partly in services higher than bodily labour, such as horse and cart work, plough work, &c., with their own utensils and cattle, and partly in kind, that is, in corn, flax, wool, and other farm products.

A higher class still, were peasants who had acquired a fixity of these rents, and a legal perpetual right to their land, for payment of these fixed *feu* rents to the owner of the barony.

The great reform, the beneficial revolution in the social state of Prussia, by Prince Hardenberg, in 1809, and carried on during fifteen succeeding years, was the giving these three classes a permanent interest in the defence of the country, by giving every man of them a permanent legal right at once to the land he then occupied, for the quit-rent he was then paying; the labour and payments in kind for the preceding three years being taken as the rent, and valued by royal commis-

sioners sent to each district. This was the fixity of rent, — the measure which, in all probability, must be adopted in Ireland, Scotland, and perhaps England, at no distant period, — and it was carried into effect with much less difficulty than was expected. The next step in this reform was making the land, thus parcelled out into small estates among the people, their own, at such a rate or price as was not illusory for them. It would evidently have been but an illusory measure to give them land in property and perpetuity, which had to pay such a heavy quit-rent to the original owner, every year, as left nothing to the new peasant-proprietor but a bare subsistence, such as he derived from it before as *leibeigen* on the land. His condition would have been no better, and his interest in the soil no greater, than before ; and however low the conversion into money by the royal commissioners might be made of those quit-rents of labour, and products in kind, not only would his condition have been no better, but, taking the small chance of markets in an agricultural country in which all are producers, and considering the new burdens imposed on him of providing for sickness, age, losses, &c., he would in reality have been worse off as proprietor than as *leibeigen* on the land. The second step in the

process of this great social revolution provided a remedy for this evil. The land of each lot was valued, as well as the quit-rents it had to pay, and each new proprietor was entitled by law to redeem his quit-rents at a certain small number of years' purchase, either by the payment of money, if he had it, or by resigning a portion of his land to the original owner or feudal lord of it. This measure enabled the great landowner to round his estate, and to bring it into large farms, and gave the small peasant-proprietor his land free of all quit-rents or burdens but the public taxes.

It is evident that such a measure involved the direct violation of all the rights of property, and could only be justified by the most extreme necessity—for the very preservation of society, or of the state itself. But this necessity had, as regards the existence of Prussia, evidently set in. The campaigns of the preceding years had already shown, that although Prussia could bring armies into the field, her people had nothing to fight for, had no interest in the soil they were called out to defend; but, on the contrary, the people were much better off in Westphalia, and the provinces occupied by the French, than under their German social system. A similar necessity exists in Ire-

land for a similar measure. The sacred rights of property themselves must give way before the necessity of the preservation of society from a state of anarchy and barbarism; and if the rents and estates of a few thousand great landowners on one side, and the existence in a civilised state of nine millions of inhabitants on the other side, are to be weighed against each other, it is evident that either by some sudden convulsion tearing up society by the roots, or by the timely interposition of government, while it has the power, and has no external enemies, the same revolution in the state of landed property, that has been effected in Prussia, must take place at no distant period in Ireland.

Another still higher class of peasant-proprietors in Germany existing from the earliest times, and perhaps more ancient than the feudal system itself, are the proprietors of free peasants' farms (*frei bauerenhöfe*), neither paying nor receiving any feudal quit-rents or servitudes. Their land has probably never been feudalised; or else, under protection of the church, or of some other influence, has escaped from the grasp of the feudal noble. They are, in many parts of Germany, a wealthy class of peasantry, occupying considerable tracts of country, as between the mouths of the

Elbe and the Eyder, with scarcely any admixture of noble estates, or those having feudal privileges. These bauerenhofe are in general sprinkled over the country ; and their owners are equivalent to the old, almost extinct, class of English yeomen.

If several of these small properties have been bought and consolidated into one estate, it forms one of the not noble-estates, which alone persons not noble by birth were entitled to buy. Until the French revolution, in most parts of Germany nobles only could buy or hold noble estates ; that is, estates having leibeigenschaft over the peasants, baronial courts and privileges, and exemption from taxes and public or local burdens affecting the bauerenhofe, and those non-noble estates having no feudal privileges.

The highest class of proprietors — the barons, counts, and nobles — hold, or rather held, large estates, noble, and endowed with feudal rights and privileges. The war, the change in the expense of living, the abolition in general of the feudal payments of former times, and of the social importance of the nobles, the distribution of land among the peasantry in Prussia, and the extinction almost everywhere of leibeigenschaft, have, together with their own extravagance, reduced this class, from the kind of petty sovereignty and

rude power and social importance which they enjoyed over all Germany, immediately previous to the French revolutionary war, to depend for a living, or for social distinction, on office, civil or military. They are the higher functionary-class in the civil service, the officer-class in the military service of every German government. The office is often, under the functionary system, made for the official holding it — a superfluous office as far as the ends of good government are concerned, but affording a living to one of a class of functionaries who are now to the crown what the class of landed nobility were formerly. The throne is now, in every continental kingdom, surrounded by a personal, official, not an hereditary nobility. They have nothing hereditary but their pride. Their social importance is derived, not from their fixed stake in the country as landed proprietors or capitalists, but from their personal standing in the civil or military service, and from the personal distinction of decorations, orders, and function. The day of trial has not yet appeared, in which this new arrangement of society, which has been gradually forming since the final settlement of Europe in 1815, this division of the social body in Germany into two classes only, the governing or functionary class, and the governed, will be

proved. Its effects as yet have been to keep the people in a low moral, intellectual, and political condition, in a thraldom of mind, person, property, and industry, to a great body of functionaries living upon them, supported at their expense, yet altogether unnecessary for their good government. A class of independent country gentlemen or nobility, or middle-rank capitalists, or sturdy independent artizans or workmen, living without government employment, not caring for it, bound to their State, and supporting it from higher considerations than salary or official duty, and thinking and acting for themselves in religion, politics, and business, according to their own judgment, good sense, and free will, does not exist in Germany.

VII.

BETWEEN the higher and lower classes in such a social body as the German, the intercourse, and even familiarity, may be great, yet the common feeling and interchange of opinion very small. It is as in a ship, or a regiment, in which the officers know the men only through their duties and discipline, know them well in that one capacity, but know in reality less of them as their fellow citizens or their fellow men, less of their opinions, their sentiments, and home affairs, than any third person who stands in no such artificial relation to them. This kind of military relation between the different classes of society keeps men far more apart from each other in reality, although in appearance there may be more of familiarity between them, than in our less feudalised structure of society in England. The want of a common feeling and common interests and objects is best illustrated by the effects it has produced in the German language. The usages, or idiomatic expressions, of the language of a people, display, perhaps, better than any other indication, the

social relations of the different classes in a country. In English and French the same form of language is used in addressing all, from the sovereign to the meanest beggar. All are addressed equally by the personal pronoun *you*, or *vous*. In French the singular number of the pronoun is used from fondness or familiarity — *tu*, and, although rarely, it is sometimes used to inferiors. The usage of the English language admits of no such difference of expression, no such inferiority between the classes of society, or between man and man, as entitles the highest to address the lowest in any other terms than are used in communication between equals. The German language has no less than four very distinct modes and gradations of expressing the different relative social positions of the person addressed. *Sie*, the third personal pronoun in the plural number, is the equivalent to *you* or *vous*, the plural of the second personal pronoun used in English or French, and is used in the same way between equals. *Du* is also equivalent to the French *tu* in expressing not only affection between the persons speaking, but also, when applied to an inferior, in expressing the inferiority of the person spoken to, as when an officer speaks to a private soldier. The use of *du* in speaking to the privates in the Prussian land-

wehr by their officers, is at present highly resented, and a subject of great dispute, it being considered degrading, because the ranks of the landwehr are filled by gentlemen often superior to their officers in birth, education, and fortune, and who think themselves therefore entitled to be addressed by their officers with *sie*, not *du*. But German has two forms of speech more in addressing inferiors, and marking the difference of social station between the speaker and the person he is speaking to. The third person singular *er* is used instead of *sie* by a person of the higher class addressing an inferior. It is an usage of language, not the pride or arrogance of the individual, and is formed from the state of society. The person of the upper class addresses the person of the lower with *er*, the master his menial, the noble or man of rank the non-noble or inferior. A still more contemptuous form of expression for indicating the distance between the talker and the person addressed, in social station, is *man*, *viz.* *one*, used instead of *er* or *sie*. The inferior is not addressed in the personal pronoun when speaking to him, but as a thing having no personal station or existence, — *man*. The noble addresses his labourer or menial with *man*: his bailiff, tenant, tradesman with *er*, his equal with *sie*: but it

would be a gross insult if he were to use *er* to an equal, or to a person claiming to be above the lower or middle classes, and still more if he were to address such a person with *man* ; yet he applies these forms to persons of the lower and middle classes by the usage of the language, without perhaps any personal pride or arrogance in the speaker. This form of language may be thought a matter very unimportant in itself, a mere grammatical difference from the English or French ; but language is the expression of mind, of the public mind ; and it indicates more truly than any other expression of it, the manners and state of society, the civilization and independence, and the social spirit of a people. These forms of expression mark a distance, a non-intercourse, a want of mutual communication and feeling, and of interchange of ideas, and sympathies, and knowledge of each other, between the classes using them. They indicate the state of society in Germany — the relations between its classes.

An important impediment, arising from language also, to the opinions and feelings of the upper, educated, and enlightened class working downwards to the lowest class, and spreading through the mass of the people ; and to those of the lowest class working upwards, and becoming

known to the higher, is that, throughout the greater part of Germany, the lower classes speak, in reality, a different language from the German of the upper educated class. The difference is not merely, as in the different provincial dialects of France or England, a difference in the pronunciation, and in the use of obsolete words and phrases, but a radical difference in the construction and forms. The Platt Deutsch used by the lower, and even the middle classes over all the north of Germany, is a language as distinct as its sister languages, the Dutch or the Danish, from the cultivated German used in literature, and by the higher classes. It has not been latinised in the middle ages, and is without the distinctions of genders, and cases, declensions, and the artificial construction and collocation of words in the sentence, which characterise the modern cultivated German. The latter is in reality an acquired language, not a mother tongue, to the mass of the people, one in which they do not think or communicate freely as in a native tongue. With us, if the common man does not understand your language, it is because his ear has not been accustomed to your pronunciation of the words. Pronounce the vowels in his country way, and he understands you. In Germany, it is not

merely the ear, but the mind of the common man that has to acquire the language, not in common use by him, of the upper classes; and the communications between them are consequently constrained, as between persons conversing together in a foreign tongue.

The occupations and amusements of the upper classes in Germany, being much more sedentary and refined than with us, consisting principally in music, reading, theatrical entertainment, conversation, visiting, and social enjoyment, and much less in hunting, shooting, riding, racing, boating, and all the active rough sports and tastes which occupy our young men of the higher classes, and bring them into daily familiar intercourse with the lower, as assistants and partakers in their common pursuit, keep those classes in Germany much more apart from, and ignorant of, each other than they are in England. The son of a nobleman or country gentleman of the largest fortune and highest family in England, is intellectually, and in his tastes and habitual enjoyments, not very different, or rather is very much the same as the son of a farmer or of a man of the lower class. The difference is more in the means and scale of enjoyment, than in the tastes of the two persons at the extreme ends of our social body. They

have many objects, pursuits, feelings, occupations, sports, in common, and bringing them together. These are, perhaps, low in taste, and denote a low standard of intellectual development among our higher classes, but they bring the lower up to that standard, establish a wholesome intercourse and exchange of ideas between them—for the lowest can understand and talk of horses, dogs, guns, or yachts, as well as the highest—and denote a higher social state of the whole, than if the upper class were so far refined and educated beyond the mass of the people below, as to be, as in Germany, a froth without spirit or flavour, swimming on the surface, and altogether different in substance from the good liquor at the bottom.

The social state of Germany is similar to that of British India. The upper enlightened class, consisting of civil and military functionaries, lawyers, judges, and officers connected with the administration of law and collection of revenue, bankers, merchants, and professional men, is different in language, habits, ideas, and feelings, from the Hindoo people whom it governs; is little acquainted with them—does not mix with them—has little knowledge of them but what circumstances may force upon its notice, yet governs

them tolerably well, and the great mass of the inert Indian population below it is submissive, and contented with the state of pupillage in which they exist.

To this great lower mass of the people in Germany, the opinions, political or religious, of the upper class scarcely penetrate. They do not at all take up the German Catholic church. On the contrary, they are evidently in the same intellectual and religious condition in which they were four centuries ago — quite as ready for pilgrimages, or crusades, or whatever superstition or belief the church of Rome may impose on them. They are not ripe for this movement.

VIII.

IT is to be remembered, also, that in all Catholic and mixed Catholic and Protestant countries under autocratic government, the church of Rome is, and always in the middle ages has been, the church of liberty; that is to say, its clergy, drawn mainly from the lower classes, are the only class in the social body independent of the autocratic government. Historians are courtiers. Their readers swell with indignation at their descriptions of the pomp, and pride, and haughtiness of the popes and prelates of the middle ages, of an emperor doing penance in his shirt, and suing for forgiveness, — a Henry on his knees, before a Becket: but they forget that these priests represented and were upheld by the popular feeling, — the feeling for independence. The church of Rome, in which the lowest-born man of the lowest class might aspire to the highest dignity, and at once, in the lowest station of the priesthood, attained a position independent of the despotism, misrule, and autocratic governments of the age, was the asylum of civil rights, was popular because it was the only barrier against universal slavery. If church and

state had been united under the sovereign of the country in the middle ages, all Europe would have been, with regard to civil rights and political institutions, what Russia, or the Turkish empire, is at the present day. The church of Rome, with her clergy depending upon the Pope alone, was the only check upon the monarch, and the nobles or governing class. The British constitution may be traced to a spirit of independence inherited from the Saxons or the Northmen; but that spirit was kept alive by the church of Rome, by her independence of and struggles against the authority of the despotic government; and Becket and the popish priesthood, by fostering that spirit of independence and of resistance to the will of the sovereign, contributed more perhaps than any of the Henrys, and more than any other social institution existing in those times, to its subsequent formation. At the present day, in Prussia and the other kingdoms in Germany of mixed religion, the church of Rome is still in the same popular position as in the middle ages, — an independent institution standing between the autocratic sovereign and his subjects, — is still the only asylum of independent feeling, — is still the only power in the social body independent of cabinet orders and public functionaries. It is but half a dozen

years ago that the late king of Prussia abolished by a cabinet order the very name of the Protestant church, amalgamated its two branches, Lutheranism and Calvinism, into a new thing called the Evangelical church, without any precise doctrine, and with a service and liturgy of his own formation. The Lutherans who adhered to their ancient doctrine and service were persecuted, their ministers were imprisoned, troops were quartered upon them to force them into conformity, and above six thousand of these poor Protestant peasantry were forced to fly from their country, to abandon their little properties, and seek a refuge in America from the tyranny and oppression of their sovereign. Although that sovereign will be consigned in the history of this century to the infamy of having broken his solemn promise to give his subjects a representative constitution, and to the still deeper infamy of having been the last European sovereign who, in an enlightened age and country, persecuted men for their religion, yet such is the abject state of the public mind in Germany, that the literary sycophants, — the most eminent men in Europe for literary and scientific attainments, whom like another Augustus he had gathered round his throne — exhaust themselves in adulation of his

memory; and because he was the best of patrons to them, would make posterity believe that he was the best of kings to his people. His persecution or interference in any way with the religious opinions of his subjects could not have taken place, if the Protestant church in Prussia had had a head out of the country like the Roman Catholic church, acknowledged by the priest and people, and to which alone in matters of faith they would yield obedience. The literary men at Berlin could not give that protection to Lutherans which the poorest popish priest in Prussia could give to his congregation. This external support is the only check in the autocratic countries at the present day, against the most fearful despotic sway over the mind and body of every subject. How powerfully this barrier against despotism protects the mass of the people, is seen in this very event of the pilgrimage to Trèves. Processions and pilgrimages are strictly prohibited in Prussia by law; Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves set at defiance the arbitrary law which interfered with what he considered a religious right and privilege. He proclaims this pilgrimage to Trèves, arranges the order and succession of the innumerable processions, takes all proper means to secure the public peace, and prevent confusion and disorder,

and laughs at the cabinet order. Public meetings of the people are so strictly prohibited in Prussia, that in some parts, as in Königsburg, family meetings of more than five people cannot come together without leave. The priests, and a million and a half of people, of the church of Rome, set at defiance this arbitrary law, break through in a moment all the restraints upon personal freedom of movement imposed by the police system and military organisation of the population, and repair to Trèves, as freely as the Londoners would repair to Ascot races. The power of the church of Rome was here that barrier against arbitrary interference with civil freedom of action, which liberty and constitutional government are with us. Among a people without civil liberty and constitutional government, the spark of independence, in spiritual affairs at least, kept alive in the church of Rome, could not be extinguished with social and political advantage to the people. The religious advantage to the people from a separation from the church of Rome would depend altogether upon the people being in a state to embrace a purer religion. If the question is reduced to what really are its terms in Germany at present—Catholicism, with all its superstitions, errors, and idolatry—or no religion at all, that is

to say, not avowed infidelity, but the most torpid apathy, indifference, and neglect of all religion — it may be doubted if the latter condition of a people be preferable. The Lutheran and Calvinistic churches in Germany and Switzerland are in reality extinct. The sense of religion, its influence on the habits, observances, and life of the people, is alive only in the Roman Catholic population ; and this pilgrimage to Trèves proves the great mass of this population to be now, in the 19th century, in the same intellectual and religious state as in the 12th.

IX.

BUT what has education been about?—where are the effects of the grand national system of education established in Prussia some five-and-twenty years ago? Of the million and a half of pilgrims to the holy coat at Trèves, allowing the odd half-million for exaggeration and for foreigners from Belgium or France, a million, or some very large number estimated at a million, must have come from those provinces of Prussia in which the Prussian system of national education has been in full operation for more than the average duration of a human generation. Of the million of pilgrims from the adjacent Prussian provinces, not so many as five hundred could have been uneducated, not taught in national schools, by masters carefully trained in normal schools, to read, write, cipher, sing psalms and hymns, say catechisms and prayers according to the forms of their own church, dance the Polka, march, countermarch, and halt, and all according to the most approved system of national education. We are told by M. Cousins that a perfect system of school machinery for diffusing education among the people has been

established in Prussia — a minister of state for public education — normal schools for instructing masters, parish schools, town schools, gymnasia, learned schools, military schools, commercial schools, universities, government schools of every kind in every locality — none but approved masters allowed to teach — and all children, even of the poorest class, obliged, under penalties on the parents, to attend some school — and the religious instruction of the youth, according to the tenets of their parents, particularly attended to ; and it is the boast of statistical writers, that it would be difficult to find in Prussia an individual, not incapable of instruction from mental defect, who could not read, write, and say his catechism according to his own church. What has all this school quackery produced ? Among ourselves there are enlightened philanthropic persons who would willingly have seen a similar system of national education under a minister of state, adopted in this country. They should go, with M. Cousins at their head, on a pilgrimage to the holy coat at Trèves, and confess that they have been imposed upon themselves, and have been imposing upon the world — that the holy coat itself is not a greater deception in religion, than the Prussian school system is in the true education of the people.

The upper enlightened classes in Germany, who were sitting perfectly satisfied that the educational system of Prussia had banished ignorance from the land, and had raised her lower classes far beyond the intellectual condition of the same classes in any other country, were struck with astonishment at the unexpected phenomenon of this pilgrimage, at this display of the most gross and universal superstition which led almost one third of the total population of the most educated provinces of Prussia to adore the holy coat at Trèves.

The fact appears not altogether so surprising to those who have always maintained that the education of a people does not consist in teaching them reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and the catechism, but in teaching them to think, judge, and act for themselves in their several situations in society; and that this can only be taught to a people by themselves, by giving them civil liberty, free use and exercise of mind, body, property, and industry, in their own affairs, without the interference and superintendence of, and reference to, government functionaries, in all social and individual action; in a word, by emancipating the people from the state of pupilage in which they are held. The value of reading, writing, and

all other school attainments, cannot be too highly rated; but still they are but the means, not the end, in mental cultivation; and this pilgrimage proves that they are useless as means, if the mind has not freedom to think, judge, and act for itself in life, which is true education, and not the getting by heart the multiplication table or the catechism. The catechism, with all the doctrine belonging to it, explained, got by heart, and understood by the scholar, does not make him a Christian, any more than the multiplication table makes him a banker. He is but a repeating machine, if his own mind is inert, and does not apply, or, from the nature of the functionary social system in Germany, is prevented from applying, its own powers of thinking, judging, and acting as an independent rational being.

This pilgrimage has solved one great and very important question in political philosophy, and will be considered, by every reflecting observer of the historical events of our age, as one of the most remarkable facts in this half-century. At the great struggle against the power of France and the Emperor Napoleon, in 1814, the late king of Prussia solemnly and distinctly promised his people a constitution, civil liberty, and a representative legislature. The people fought for it, won

it, and were defrauded of it. The royal promise was not kept. A people may do without political liberty, that is, a voice in the enactment of their own laws by a representative constitution, if laws suitable to their condition be made and well administered; but civil liberty, that is, the unrestrained, uncontrolled freedom of mind, person, property, and industry, interfered with only on the rare occasions in which the public safety would be endangered by the individual's exercise of this freedom, is what men cannot exist without in social union, unless as slaves. This civil liberty has also been denied to the German people. Since the peace of 1815, a system of interference and state-regulation in all private action, of military duty imposed on all and robbing men of half their lives, of censorship on all opinion, of check on all movement in ordinary life, by a body of functionaries, civil, military, ecclesiastical, and literary, so numerous as to constitute the upper and middle classes, has been fully established in the Prussian and other German states, and has reduced all the social body in Germany to two classes, the governed, and the instruments of governing. A class of nobility, country gentlemen, independent capitalists, or men living by trade or manufacture, unconnected with govern-

ment function, or with any thing that government can give or take away, scarcely exists. The measures of this autocratic government, carried into effect through cabinet orders and functionaries, are often wise, good, and beneficial to the material interests of the people. No pains are spared to cast a lustre on this kind of autocratic, or, as it is called, paternal rule, and to blind the present generation and posterity to its defects. All useful discoveries or undertakings in science — all great works in the fine arts — are liberally patronised. Men of distinguished talent in every country and class have been honoured with letters, decorations, and even pensions. Humboldt, Tiek, Schlegel, and many other men of the highest philosophical and literary eminence, whose names reflect a lustre on the Prussian throne, have been seated on its steps. No means have been spared to elevate the intellectual character of the government, and to give the people an education to appreciate the encouragement lavished on the fine arts by their government. The education of the people has been systematically attended to. Prussia took the lead in appointing a minister of state for public instruction, and in educational arrangements for the whole population. The question of the political philo-

sopher still was—is it possible to educate a nation of slaves? Individuals of great natural capacity, talent, and acquirements may start up in a state of slavery, as in a state of liberty, and did so in ancient Greece and Rome. Individuals of great talent and literary name may flourish, as Humboldt, Tiek, and many other of the first literary and scientific men of our times, do now, as dependents on the autocratic ruler of a people without liberty—a people of slaves; but still the question stands—is it possible to educate a nation of slaves?

This pilgrimage of a million of people from the most educated of the Prussian provinces, to worship the holy coat at Trèves, answers the question—It is not possible. The public mind, when not allowed free action in society, cannot be educated. Giving it reading, writing, and religious instruction, without civil liberty, is giving the means and denying the use of them—is giving a man a pair of spectacles, and shutting him up in total darkness. The holy coat has proved that the public mind is in the same state of intellectual darkness in the nineteenth century, in Germany, as in the twelfth, and from the same cause,—the want of free exercise of mind in all social affairs, the want of civil and political liberty.

With what feelings must Schlegel, then approaching his death-bed, have looked out from his window at Bonn, and seen banner after banner of long processions of pilgrims, — have heard chaunt after chaunt in the breeze, as they moved, in a cloud of dust, like dark streams of lava through the land — all tending to the common centre, the white flag with a red cross waving on the tower of the cathedral at Trèves ? How bitter must have been his reflection, that this is all the end, this all the advance of the human mind, that he, and Goëthe, and all the great men with whom he had lived, and of whom he was almost the last, had effected by their labours during three quarters of a century, for elevating the intellectual condition of the people of Germany ; and that possibly the failure lay with them, with their want of bold decided character, with their undue cultivation of the imaginative and speculative in the public mind, rather than of reason, judgment, and common sense, applied to the realities of life, and with their facile acquiescence in autocratic power, and functionarism, in times when a voice from Weimar might have given civil freedom to Germany ! Goëthe, with the inspiration of his great genius, often touches and lays bare the most important truths, without being himself aware of

their importance, tendency, and application. He was in his world of ideas, like an Indian in the mines of the new world, throwing out gold or diamonds, without caring for them but as shining things, without valuing them for their social use. Goëthe himself, in one of his unconnected, unused maxims, or memorandums of thoughts, says,— “Welche Regierung das beste sey? Diejenige die uns lehrt uns selbst zu regieren.” “What government is the best? That which teaches us to govern ourselves.” Had Goëthe expanded, and applied this text, had he given the power of his genius and name to the elucidation of the great truth it contains, that without self-government and self-action the public mind makes no real progress, society no improvement; that with the people in a state of pupilage in all social and individual movement, the mind, property, industry, and even the personal freedom of each member of the community, being under the surveillance, guidance, and restraint of government, the ends of all good government,— the moral, social, and material well-being of the people,— cannot be attained; that education and knowledge at schools cannot give self-government to people bred and kept in pupilage of mind and body; had he explained all that lies under his brief aphorism, it

would have been the most useful of his works: he would have given civil freedom to Germany; he would at least have sanctioned an irresistible demand for it: while now, Goëthe's example, works, and life sanction a passive apathy of the public mind to public affairs, a contentedness with any social condition in which theatres, music, painting, and the other fine arts are patronised and enjoyed, — in which autocratic governments may do what they please, provided they give the people *panem et ludos*.

• A great part of the education in Germany, and almost all mind, is directed to æsthetic objects, — to the cultivation of the fine arts, — to taste and production in poetry, dramatic works, romance, and other imaginative or speculative literature, — to music, theatrical representation, painting, architecture, and all that comes under the name of the *Æsthetic*, — all the intellectual objects that embellish civilised life, and add to its enjoyments. Valuable as the *Æsthetic* is, when it is a flower growing spontaneously out of a high state of civilisation, it is but a poor crop to cultivate, instead of more essential things. We do not care to see a bed of tulips, where the wheat and potato crops have evidently been robbed of manure, and neglected, in order to raise them. The *Æsthetic*

is not the Moral, nor the Religious, nor, in many of its objects, such as music, painting, architecture, the Intellectual, in a people or in an individual, and it may be cultivated at the expense of higher objects and principles. This is particularly true with regard to education in Germany. The public mind, debarred from free action in public interests or private affairs, naturally occupies itself in those secondary pursuits which alone are open to it, and the autocratic governments in their educational systems, favour the cultivation and diffusion of taste in the fine arts, — of the development of the *Æsthetic* among the multitude, as a means of keeping them contented and happy. It is the old Roman policy of providing games and bread for the people, to keep them quiet under the misrule of the emperors. The preponderance of the *Æsthetic* in the education, literature, and daily life of the German people, has not worked favourably on the present generation. It has diffused a weakness and frivolity of character, a turn for ease and present enjoyment, and a disregard for, or ignorance of, higher objects than it presents to the mind. Their education, in fact, suits well such a religion as the Roman Catholic, with all its superstitions, which addresses itself to the imagination and taste — not to the reasoning and judging

faculties. It may be doubted if the people of Germany are capable of adopting a purely intellectual religion, like that of the Scotch people, or have mind enough to embrace doctrine unsupported by ceremony, show, and splendour. The whole tenor of their education, in schools and private life, cultivates imagination and taste, and leaves dormant the judgment and reason. The Evangelical and Lutheran churches suffer from this cause ; for although more full of ceremonies than the Church of England even on the Puseyite model, with their altars, lighted candles, crucifixes, dresses, chaunting, and mass, they do not address themselves sufficiently to the senses for the state of the German mind. They are government establishments ; but, as churches, are without following, or zeal, compared to the Church of Rome in Germany. Rationalism, and total indifference to all religion, prevail much more ; and, owing greatly to the tenor of education, more in the body of Protestants than among the Papists. The clergy, no doubt, adapt their sermons to their congregations ; and the sermons preached in the Protestant churches seldom have any reference to the Bible, requiring, as in Scotland, considerable knowledge of the Scriptural facts, and of the doctrines and views deduced from them, and re-

quiring considerable mental exertion to follow the subject, and form an individual judgment, right or wrong, upon it; and this is the relation between the preacher and his congregation in Scotland; but are discourses addressed to the moral nature of man, handling truths which all men admit, and which require no mental exertion, examination, or Scriptural knowledge, being self-evident moral truths which Jew or Gentile, Protestant or Papist, may give a passive assent to. The confessions of faith, and articles of dissent from the Church of Rome, given above, show clearly the vast educational difference between the people of Germany, taught by compulsion in their government schools, and the people of Scotland, taught at home, or voluntarily in their parish schools, and educated in freedom of thought and action. These confessions of faith are drawn up and adopted by congregations of the middle class, and of the most enlightened and educated of the Roman Catholic body, and some of them in the most distinguished cities of Germany, viz., Leipsic, Berlin, Breslau. It would be difficult, as we have stated before in these Notes, to find a dozen ploughmen or labourers in Scotland who could not draw out a much more soundly reasoned confession of faith, and articles of dissent from the doctrines and prac-

tices of the Church of Rome, than any one of these twelve documents given above, and showing the Scriptural grounds on which they retain or reject any of her tenets, and certainly not committing the error in correct reasoning which runs through every one of these — of admitting practices, yet repudiating the principles on which they are founded ; and admitting principles, yet repudiating the practices which legitimately flow from the principles admitted.

X.

A GREAT defect in the education of the people in Germany, and to which the downfall of the Protestant church, and of all religion but the superstitions of Popery, may be mainly ascribed, is, that the people are not educated in religious habits. The Church of Rome can afford to give up the half of Sunday to the amusements which occupy the people, because the close connection of her priests, through the confessional, with the people, and the numerous church services during the week, much more than make up for the half-Sunday passed in recreation: but the Protestant church is in no such position. It has but about two hours in the week for religion, having adopted every where on the Continent the Roman Catholic usage of a morning service only, the afternoon meeting being in general for baptisms and such clerical duties. Two hours a week is certainly too small a portion of time to sustain a church, to raise a sense of religion, and to form religious habits among a people. The strict observance of Sunday in England,

and especially in Scotland, the restraint upon all, even the most innocent, recreation, the voluntary cessation of all business, pleasure, or work of man or beast, may be puritanical, unwarranted in Scripture, nay, positively prejudicial to mind and body, and to religion itself in the case of our working population pent up all the week in the foul atmosphere of manufactories and close alleys, debarred, by this sabbath observance, from the enjoyment of fresh air, and the devotional feelings which the man who is but rarely alone with nature, finds in his Sunday walk through the green fields; and it may too often tend to drive him for relaxation to the gin-palace and its excesses on Monday; for relaxation man must have. All this may be said, and much of it with truth, with respect to particular localities, such as London, Glasgow, Manchester, against the present rigid observance of Sunday with us. But this is to be said in favour of it. This voluntary observance is the application of principle to practice by a whole people. It is a working of their religious sense and knowledge — be the strict observance right or wrong — upon their habits. It is a sacrifice of pleasures, in themselves innocent — and these are the most difficult to be sacrificed — to a higher principle than self-in-

dulgence. The sense of religion is not dead, if it even be applied erroneously in this strict observance of Sunday, and influences all daily life on that day. A self-acting population voluntarily renouncing self-indulgence in pleasure, or business, from religious principle — the restrictions of law on Sunday recreations are too unimportant to be considered — stands on a much higher moral and intellectual step than the population of the continent who devote the Sunday to animal enjoyment, or the gratification of the acquired tastes for music, dancing, theatrical representation, or other refined pleasures. They are of a higher character. The German-Catholic church will have to form such a character in the population, or it will be of no extent or duration: and the whole education, habits, and character of the present generation of the German people are adverse to such a change.

Are the lower classes of people on the continent, and more particularly in Germany, in a higher social, moral, and physical condition, than our population of the same class? This is the *condition of England question*, as it has been called by Carlyle. The question will be answered according to the measure or standard we apply to the condition of a people. If we take physical or material

well-being, an easy, contented, amused, care-free life — care-free from beginning to end compared to our sea of troubles — as the *summum bonum*, the true well-being of a man, the one thing and only thing needful in his social condition, then are the German lower classes, who enjoy for a small proportion comparatively of their day's earnings the necessaries and comforts of life, and the pleasures of the pipe of tobacco, the Sunday evening recreation of tea-gardens, of dancing assemblies, of the music of Mozart or Beethoven, which they have a taste sufficiently cultivated to appreciate, on a much higher stage of civilisation and well-being than our lower classes. But if we hold that the moral, social, intellectual, religious condition of man, as a being endowed with reason, ought to be something higher than, and different from, a mere agreeable existence in all physical comfort, and in the utmost enjoyment of those pleasures of taste which, although not sensual, are received through the senses, and depend upon the more or less perfect natural organisation of the animal, and the more or less continual exercise of the organs of sense, as much as upon mind, we may doubt if it be the right measure of the condition of men that we are applying, when we find the condition of the lower classes in Germany superior to that of our

lower classes. *Panem et ludos* they have undoubtedly in much greater abundance. They are educated also to appreciate and enjoy all the fine arts and innocent tastes which embellish and sweeten life. But where is their sense of civil and social rights? Where is their love of freedom, their love of country, their action as independent men in society? Where is their sense of religion? Where is their practical sense of right and wrong applied to daily life independently of police superintendence? Where are their activity and industry out of doors, their domestic habits at home? Their physical condition as human animals may be better; their social, moral, and religious condition as men is inferior.

XI.

ONE of the main grounds on which the German-Catholic church is to rest, is its nationality. It is to be a German-Catholic, instead of a Roman or Italian Catholic church. Ronge himself appeals, in his address, to this nationality for throwing off the yoke of the Pope and the hierarchy of the church of Rome.

This nationality would be an excellent foundation for a social or political movement, if it had any real existence in the German mind, but what has it to do with religion—with the Christian religion? A Christian church can only be founded on Christianity, that is, on some doctrine, be it right or wrong, to be looked for in the Bible. A political not a religious foundation of a Christian church would be a monstrous moral excrescence—would in principle be the same as the Greek national church in Russia, in which the Emperor is deified. But this nationality has no existence, and, from natural circumstances, can have none in Germany. It is but a thing talked of, and wished for among literary and manufacturing men; but is not in

the mind or life of the mass of the people. They are eminently susceptible of loyalty, of personal attachment to their kings, or leaders, but not of the spirit of nationality. From the days of Tacitus, Germany has been what it now is,—a land divided among different tribes bound together by no common tie, although of one race, and speaking one language. For this there are natural reasons; viz. the identity of products over all the land, and consequently the want of dependence or intercourse between the parts for the supply of each other's wants. In countries like France or England, the natural products are so distributed that one part lives by the other, and could not live without it. The coals, wine, cattle, grain, fish, of one part, supply the wants of another, and bind all together by common interests into one whole, one nation with a common national spirit. But in Germany each little group of people, province, or state, is provided, by the bounty of nature, with all it requires within itself. The coasts of the Baltic and the coasts of the lake of Constance produce the very same grain, wood, and products of every kind, and in sufficient abundance for the inhabitants. What is there to connect these inhabitants into one nation having common interests? Language, here again, gives us the true

expression of the social state of a people. The Germans have in their language no word for country in its national sense, no expression equivalent to mother-country. They have only a *father-land*. They have not those feelings to express for a common country, which are more akin to those a man feels for the mother who bore him, and nursed him, than for the father who begot him, and which constitute love of country, and national spirit. The less intense tie to the father, not the more intense tie to the mother, is taken in the German language to express the feeling for country in the German mind. The German commercial league begins already to fall asunder from this want of common interests to bind together its parts into one national body. The southern states, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden, Saxony, begin to discover that they are naturally and essentially agricultural countries, and never can be any thing else, and they complain loudly of the protective duties in favour of German manufactures as a sacrifice of their true interest which is to buy what they require as cheaply as they can. The union they consider a mere deception to enrich a few manufacturing districts on the Rhine with which they have no common interests, and for the benefit of which they must

pay high prices for inferior goods, while none of their products can be taken in return. In Saxony even, which has large manufacturing establishments, the complaint is general that to encourage the industry of a particular class the increase of which is of very doubtful benefit to the general well-being, the great mass of the community, which is agricultural, not manufacturing, is sacrificed. A commercial union of the Southern States and Austria, dropping all the fancies of newspaper writers of creating a political body, a German nation, with fleets, colonies, and protective duties, yet having no natural ties or common interests, appears now to be in general favour. The gross errors in the Prussian management of the German commercial league have raised also a spirit of opposition to Prussia in those countries of the South of Germany which have representative assemblies, such as Wurtemberg, Saxony, Baden, in which the middle and mercantile class can at least speak out. Statesmen bred up in the bureau of some functionary at Berlin, with the contracted views and ignorance of the great commercial combinations of interests which now connect nations, make a silly figure in handling by legislation the great and complicated commercial and monied affairs of Germany. The illiberal domes-

tic policy of Prussia stands in the most glaring inconsistency with the professed objects of the league. The vacillation between liberal professions and despotic doings in the regulation of trade, of social institutions, of religion, of the free circulation of opinions through the press, have been occasionally discussed in those assemblies of the representatives of the middle class, in the other States of Germany, in which there is any liberty of discussion. Every step Germany takes in commercial and social prosperity makes the functionary and autocratic system of government more anomalous and inconsistent with the state of society. A poor country, like Russia for instance, may be governed by a large body of civil and military functionaries quartered over it, and embracing in its upper ranks all the nobles and the wealthy; but as soon as a new and wealthier class is formed by trade, who are not connected with the government by the ties of function, and who reduce the best paid of the former upper classes to obscurity and insignificance in the eyes of the people, by their real and material social influence, where are the elements of good, stable, and respected government? In all autocratic governments, even where the functionary class is that which has otherwise the most social influence in

the country, there is always the innate element of bad government, that the sovereign and his servants change places — the sovereign governing in the small affairs, and the functionaries in the great. While the Prussian functionaries have been endeavouring to bring all Germany into one cauldron, by common interests, to be regulated by Prussian influence, the king drills a hole in the bottom of it, through which all the nationality oozes out. By a premature assumption of autocratic power over the subjects of an independent German state, the influence of Prussia in the German league has been shaken to the foundation. Two members of the Chamber of Deputies of Baden, Itstein, and Hecker, distinguished as leaders of the liberal party in it, came in the month of June to Berlin on a tour of relaxation and business, after the close of their session, with the intention of proceeding by the railroad to Stettin, and from thence by the steam-vessel to Copenhagen. Although provided with regular passports from the Prussian minister at Baden, these persons were arrested in the night time at their inn, on their arrival at Berlin, and ignominiously conducted by the police to the frontier from which they had come, and ordered to quit the Prussian dominions. No cause was given, no

irregularity in their conduct or their papers was alleged, as an excuse for this infringement on the personal liberty of subjects of a State belonging to the German league, whose business or pleasure led them to cross the Prussian territories. It was simply the will of the autocrat. This small incident has made a deep impression in Germany, and has shaken in all the States of the league the desire to embark with Prussia in one ship under the flag of a German nationality. If these respectable persons, who, from their social position, may have had weighty commercial objects in view on their tour, are thus summarily arrested and banished with ignominy without reason assigned, but simply in the blind rage of despotism against liberal opinions delivered in their own representative assembly, and with which their own government could find no fault, where is the security, it is asked every where out of Prussia, of subjects belonging to other States in the German league, who may have business to transact in Prussia itself, or in the countries to which they can only have access by crossing the Prussian dominions? This little event of the blind interposition of the Prussian autocrat with the scheme of a German league under Prussian protection, has opened the eyes of those States in the South which have repre-

sentative chambers, and some freedom of discussion, to the danger of their becoming in the end the mere slaves of Prussia and her autocratic functionary system, by their continuance in the present commercial league, and by the proposed nationality of all Germany.

If nationality could be raised in spite of natural and of political and social circumstances, to be an efficient influence in Germany, as it is in France, England, and the countries which by nature are the habitations of distinct connected nations with common interests and a common spirit, and if this nationality were a sound principle to found a Christian church upon, which it certainly is not, still the new German-Catholic church would have to begin by creating the principle in the German mind upon which it proposes to stand, for as yet it has no existence among the great mass of the German population. It is a thing only talked of and sung of by a few literary and speculative people, an imitation, not a reality, even with them. The German-Catholic church is of premature birth, if, as Ronge proposes in his address, the German nationality is to be its mother, for it has come into the world before its parent.

XII.

THE thirty-eight different States composing the confederation of Germany are, in diplomacy, one body represented by deputies resident at Frankfort, who manage the external relations of the whole, and such internal affairs, the censorship of the press in particular, as are considered of common interest ; and have likewise a common army, made up by contingent troops from each State, in proportion to its population, amounting in all to 303,493 men. Each State pays and keeps its own quota of this army at home, so that it is only in name a national German force. Each quota is Austrian, Prussian, Hessian, Mecklenburgian, or whatever the State may be to which it belongs, and in which it is raised, paid, and doing duty, until, at long intervals, it is assembled, mustered, and reviewed by an officer of the general confederation. The total population of the thirty-eight States of the German confederation is reckoned to be 39,788,069 souls. This estimate includes the Austrian and Prussian provinces within the confederation, as having been parts of the ancient

German empire, but not those without, as Poland, Lombardy, &c. The number of Catholics in these thirty-nine or forty millions is reckoned to be about nineteen millions.

Austria has, within the German confederation, a population of 11,725,540 people altogether Catholic, the Protestants not exceeding 200,000 persons. Bavaria has a population of 4,440,327 people, of whom 3,061,547 are Catholics, and the government is Catholic. Wurtemberg has a population of 1,701,726 people, of whom 519,425 persons only are Catholic, and the government is Protestant. Saxony has 1,757,800 people and only 30,375 Catholics, but the king is Catholic. Prussia has a total population of 14,928,501 people, of whom 11,388,166 are within the German confederation. The Catholics are reckoned to be 5,617,020. The Prussian provinces on the Rhine and Westphalia contain 3,974,847 Prussian subjects, of whom 2,730,805 are Catholics. Baden, Hesse, and the minor States have all a mixed population.

The time has come when the sovereigns of Germany might throw off the connection of their own subjects with a foreign power, and get rid of a hierarchy independent of their governments acknowledging only the authority of the Pope, and wield-

ing the most dangerous of weapons, the superstition and fanaticism of the multitude, at their discretion. To autocratic powers such a connection must always be galling, and in the recent disputes of the Prussian monarch with the Archbishops of Posen and Cologne regarding-mixed marriages, it has proved highly vexatious. The vast and sudden assemblage of pilgrims at Trèves, in the very teeth of prohibitory laws, shows that it may also become dangerous. It cannot be doubted that a "Catholicism without the Pope" adopted voluntarily and zealously by the Catholic population, would be one of the greatest political objects for the European sovereigns of our times. There are, however, various under-currents which may prevent the attainment of this object.

The great mass of the Roman Catholic population in Germany, even in the most educated provinces, are evidently not ripe for it. The movement is confined entirely to the towns, and to the enlightened of the middle and higher classes of the Catholics indignant at the successful attempt of the ultramontane clergy of the Church of Rome to recal the superstition and fanaticism of the middle ages by this pilgrimage to Trèves, and actuated, perhaps, as much by shame at being connected with such bigotry and superstition, as

by any true religious zeal, or feeling. The German-Catholic church itself is not, as yet at least, presented in a consistent shape, and with any sound positive doctrine.

In Austria and Bavaria, the sovereigns themselves being Catholics, as well as the great majority of their subjects, the bigotry of the highest and the lowest classes may coincide in sacrificing all political considerations to a conscientious belief in the divine right of the Pope and the church of Rome to their spiritual and clerical authority. Bohemia has always retained a spirit adverse to the church of Rome, and has been of old a hotbed of religious ferment. To keep the new Catholic schism out of that country is a political object with the Austrian government. It is impossible, however, to prevent opinions and knowledge from getting in, where goods and dealers are going out. The glass manufacturers of Bohemia necessarily keep up a constant communication and intercourse with Leipsic, Frankfort, Berlin, and the principal towns in which congregations of the German-Catholic church are formed or forming; and the desire for a Christian church purer than the church of Rome, and unconnected with its hierarchy and superstitions, is said to be spreading widely there, and with deeper religious roots in

the mind of that simple, but reflective people, who still know, and cherish the tradition, that their forefathers held the same idea of a Christian church, and suffered for it, than in the other populations of Germany. Among the 4,174,168 inhabitants of Bohemia 3,962,652 are reckoned Catholics, but, it is said, with such a strong repugnance still lingering among them to the church of Rome, that the priests have little influence, and the people are quite ripe to embrace with zeal a schism of purer doctrine. All pamphlets and newspapers concerning the German-Catholic church, and all mention of it, or notice of its existence, are strictly prohibited by the Austrian government.

Bavaria has a total population of 4,440,327 people, of whom 3,061,547 are Catholics, and the sovereign is one of the most bigoted among them. The Protestant population here, consisting of 1,180,358, is only saved from active persecution by its numerical force. The Protestants are obliged by royal order to kneel at the processions of the priests with the host; and lately a Protestant clergyman, who was accused of encouraging his parishioners to refuse compliance with this idolatrous ceremony, was arrested, imprisoned, and actually stripped naked

and his body inspected by a surgical officer, to see if the aged man could, without danger to his life, be subject to the corporal punishment of the lash! Such is the spirit of government in Munich, the centre of the fine arts in Germany, the capital in which the *Æsthetic* is cultivated as the true means of civilisation! The Bavarian monarch will not even tolerate the name of a German-Catholic church, and prohibits the use of it in the newspapers. The *Algemeine Zeitung* even, which, although published at Augsburg in the Bavarian dominions, is a European newspaper, one which the governments the most hostile to the newspaper press are obliged to tolerate, because, from its great circulation, and the confidence generally reposed in its information and views, no other organ of communication between the autocratic rulers and their own subjects can be found, is subject to this Bavarian restriction. The German governments may order official newspapers to be published with official intelligence and official opinions in their little capitals, but they cannot order the people to buy, read, and believe these local newspapers issued from the government bureaux. Men will go elsewhere for their news and opinions, and will not read the go-

vernment paper, even if all others were suppressed. This European newspaper, however, the *Algemeine Zeitung*, has been obliged to abstain from giving any special intelligence about this schism, and to drop the name of the German Catholics in its columns, and call them the new dissidents, or schismatics. Words and opinions cannot be put down by royal edicts. They fly about the world in spite of all restriction. The greater the restriction, the greater the circulation.

The Grand Duke of Baden has in his dominions a population of 1,335,200 people, but the proportion of Catholics has probably not been taken at the census in 1843. The German-Catholic congregations are not favoured, but are not prohibited.

In the kingdom of Wirtemberg, with a population of 1,701,726 people, of whom 519,425, or about one third, are Catholics, the government wisely lets the German-Catholic congregations alone, and neither favours nor discourages them.

In the kingdom of Saxony the population is more entirely Protestant. The king and 30,725 of his subjects only are Catholics, out of a total population of 1,787,800 people. The circle or province and the city of Dresden have 440,623

inhabitants, by the last census of 1843, and of these 6,443 are Catholics. The German-Catholic church has one congregation of about a hundred members in Dresden. The circle or province of Leipsic and the town have together 393,771 inhabitants, of whom 2,200 are Catholics. The town of Leipsic has also one congregation of the German-Catholic church. The two country districts, Zwickau and Bautzin, which contain the rest of the 30,700 Catholics, do not appear to have any congregations, or to take any part in the movement. This appears to be generally the case; the town populations only, not the country population, are ripe for throwing off the church of Rome. There can be but few of a middle class, except in the towns, sufficiently enlightened, and sufficiently independent, to form congregations. In Saxony the right to baptize and marry by their own ministers has been refused the German-Catholic church.

Hesse, Anhalt, Saxe Cobourg, Darmstad, and all the minor German states, appear to be waiting the course of events, and the policy adopted by the greater powers. In the north of Germany the king of Hanover has a population in his dominions of 1,755,592 people, of whom 219,682 are Catholics. He has published a manifesto against the German-

Catholic church, in which he states, "that he will allow no Christian sect in his dominions which does not fully acknowledge the right of the State to regulate all its concerns." His Hanoverian Majesty overlooks the little circumstance that the 200,000 Catholics in his dominions acknowledge no such right. It is fortunate that, with such principles of government in church and state, the king of Hanover is now far removed from any chance of succeeding to the British crown.

In Brunswig, Mecklenburg, Holstein, and in the Free Towns, Frankfort, Bremen, Hamburgh, Lubec, the movement has its free course.

XIII.

ALL eyes, in fact, are turned to Prussia, where this movement began, and is most widely diffused.

The population of the whole Prussian kingdom, by the census of 1840, was then 14,928,501 people, of whom 5,617,020 were Catholics living mixed, in every province, with Protestants. In Westphalia, the Catholics have a small majority of numbers, being 777,673 Catholic inhabitants to 591,647 Protestants. In the Rhine provinces, the Catholic majority is larger, there being 1,953,132 Catholic inhabitants and 610,830 Protestants. In Silesia, the Catholics are 1,357,330, and the Protestants 1,474,773 persons. In the province of Posen, the Catholics are 783,916, and the Protestants 372,879. In all the other provinces, the Protestant population is the majority, although in all there is a considerable body of Catholics. It is evident, from this view of the distribution of the Protestant and Catholic populations, that the question of mixed marriages was not a mere idle assumption of power by the church of Rome, but was fraught with great

misery to the people, and with great danger to the State. The assumption was, that in all marriages between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant (and where the numbers of each religion are so nearly equal such marriages must have been of daily occurrence, or else the two populations must have been living in a state of religious estrangement, animosity, and feud,) the children of such a marriage should, in all cases, be brought up in the Roman Catholic faith. If not, the Catholic parent was denied the sacraments, and other religious rites and consolations of the Catholic church. The whole of Prussia must, under the operation of this assumption, have become, at no distant period, Roman Catholic: and the affliction carried home into the interior of families by it could not be suffered by any government. This vexatious question still exists between the government of Prussia and the Roman hierarchy. It is evident that in this German-Catholic church lies the germ of the emancipation of the Prussian sovereign from this assumed power of the hierarchy of Rome, dangerous to the state, and subversive of the domestic happiness of his subjects. If the German-Catholic church succeed, even to a moderate extent, it reduces at once the Roman Catholic church and hierarchy to a mere sect, more or less nume-

rous, but entitled to no pre-eminence as the only Catholic church; especially if the new German-Catholic church frame its doctrine and ritual so that the rejection of the Pope, of the Roman hierarchy, of auricular confession, of interference with the religious education of children of mixed marriages, and of all the more grossly superstitious usages of the church of Rome, be the only difference. The government of Prussia is evidently waiting to see the progress, development, and future shape of this German-Catholic church. It has published an interim cabinet order acknowledging the perfect freedom of conscience in religious belief as the right of its subjects established by the ground-law of the monarchy, but observing that two Christian churches only, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant, are received as churches by the state, and that other denominations of Christians, such as the old Lutherans and the Mennonites, are but sects tolerated, but not acknowledged by law; so that the baptisms and marriages of this new sect must be celebrated by the Protestant minister of the parish. This cabinet order, however, is, like many other such crude acts of legislation issued by the functionary government of Prussia, a dead letter, because it is opposed to other existing laws. In the pro-

vinces on the Rhine, in Westphalia, and in Posen, and Polish Prussia, where this movement is most rife, the Code Napoleon is the law of the land, and marriage and baptism are, in the eye of the law, civil affairs, not requiring for their legal validity and registration any thing but a declaration before the civil magistrate. The religious ceremony does not enter under the cognisance of the law at all. In other provinces of Prussia, the Protestant clergy say, in no spirit of hostility to the German-Catholic church, which they rejoice to assist, but merely to bring the government to a point, that they cannot be forced to marry parties not of their own persuasion and church, and who may not indeed be Roman Catholics, but are equally far from being Protestants in doctrine; and of whom, as members of any church, they know nothing. As the members of the German-Catholic church are marrying and baptizing by their own ministers where they are entitled to do so by the law, and the rest, living in other provinces, cannot be left without means of having the religious ceremony of marriage legally performed, this absurd cabinet order will probably be rescinded.

The Prussian government perhaps may have thought it consistent with its own dignity, and

due to the great Catholic powers of Europe, to make this demonstration of having no sympathy with, and giving no encouragement to, this movement, but at the same time stating the principle of the right of its subjects to freedom of religious belief, in case the movement should spread, and become so important as to require the acknowledgement of the state. In the mean time an ambiguous toleration is accorded to it. Ronge and Czerzki are allowed to go round to the congregations which require them, and no impediment is thrown in the way of the movement. Its progress is allowed to be mentioned in the newspapers; and in some towns in which the municipality, or the parishioners, are the legal owners of the town-hall, or the Protestant church, no objection has been made to lending the use of the building for the first meetings of the congregations of the German Catholics. It is, on the whole, not persecution that this new sect has to complain of. It might even thrive better if it had a little more to endure. There is some danger that the child may die for want of a whipping. It is, in fact, obvious to all the German governments, that the assumption of the Roman-Catholic hierarchy in mixed marriages, in the struggle in Switzerland to establish the Jesuits in political power, and in the attempt

to bring back the people to the superstition of the middle ages, by pilgrimages and relic-worship, required a check, and may find it here, and one arising naturally out of the abuses. A decent reserve in openly encouraging or hastily acknowledging this schism is allowable and prudent.

XIV.

IT is possible, however, that even in Prussia and the other German countries of mixed population, the policy most suitable to their real interests may be counteracted by the jealousy of the functionary class, which in reality governs the government, and directs the actions of the State, that is of the autocratic king, in all important government movements, much more than he directs them. In the eyes of this influential class, the German-Catholic church has the unpardonable stain of having originated with the people or middle class, without leave, sanction, approval, or recommendation from them, the functionary class, representing the sovereign. The rising wealth, and display of it, in the middle, mercantile, and manufacturing class, and the spirit of independence growing with their capital, are looked upon with great jealousy by the functionary class, of which the nobility is now but a branch. The houses, style of living, equipages, and social consideration of merchants, manufacturers, bankers, and other capitalists of inde-

pendent means, begin to eclipse even in Berlin the personal grandeur, in the same things, of chiefs of departments and bureaux, with their petty salaries, and to reduce the functionaries, who, in show, income, and consideration, were but lately the first of men in their several localities, to be, *longo intervallo*, but the second. In every village with us, a similar process goes on in society. The excise officer, the retired lieutenant, the curate, are the chiefs of the social body, represent, in social importance, the civil, military, and ecclesiastical establishments of the United Kingdoms; but when the village grows to be a town, they are nobodies, and feel themselves to be so; and, if they have the power, they thwart and oppose, in all things, those by whom they are eclipsed, and shoved down, as it were, in social importance below the place in respect and appearance which they formerly held. The functionary class in Prussia are in this position, and have this bitterness of feeling towards the rising middle class of traders, manufacturers, and other capitalists, and have the power of opposing, interfering, and annoying, and, by their influence over the sovereign, of checking and quashing the most important undertakings. It is not unlikely that the jealousy of some of this class may oppose

the kind of treason against their order of such a movement as this—of congregations formed, marriages and baptisms solemnised, declarations and pamphlets circulated, and all by the class of independent traders, dealers, and others in the Catholic population of the towns, without leave or sanction of the local functionaries.

XV.

THE great mass of the Roman Catholic population of Germany is evidently not in that intellectual state in which they would spontaneously, and from their own reason and knowledge, separate themselves from the church of Rome, its hierarchy, and superstitions. The pilgrimage to the holy coat at Trèves is a sufficient indication of the true state of the public mind. The members of the schism from the church of Rome are entirely of the middle class of the Catholic population, and entirely of the town populations. The number of congregations, therefore, can be but few — one only in the largest towns — and they are scattered over all Germany from Danzig to Stuttgart. The members also of each congregation are few in numbers. A few hundreds only out of the body of Catholics have seceded. At Berlin the number of members is reported to be about two thousand; at Breslau, about the same number; at Magdeburg, about five hundred; and in other towns, from forty to two hundred persons compose the congregation who have really signed and acceded to the confession of faith of

the German-Catholic church. To account for this small amount of members, and yet proportionally numerous congregations scattered over the country, it is to be remembered that as yet the numbers of independent persons, of individuals having a living independent of government function and favour for themselves or their families, are but few even in the largest towns, and even to them government is the source of all social distinction by the general taste of the Germans for orders, decorations, personal honours, and titles conferred by government. If an equal favour and a legal acknowledgment by the government were given, in the different German states, to the congregations of the German-Catholic church, the numbers of its members would no doubt be greatly augmented by the accession of many civil functionaries, military officers, lawyers, professors, and other literary and professional men, who at present are uncertain how far it would be agreeable to the powers above, the departments of government on which they depend for a living, and for success in life. They wait to hear the determination of their superiors; like schoolboys waiting to see if the master smiles or frowns at the pranks of their comrades, before joining them. Government has in its grasp the affairs,

business, and objects of all men of the middle class, to an extent we have no adequate idea of in our social state. Every fourth or fifth individual above the lowest class is either in government employment, or expectant upon it for himself or his family, and every individual looks for his personal standing and distinction in society to some paltry title or decoration. Self-esteem and the respect of society, independent of the riband or medal showing forth the merit of the bearer from the button hole, scarcely exist in German society. From this low social condition, great numbers wait, and avow that they do so, until the German-Catholic church is approved of by their Government. This kind of waiting zeal, this prudent subjection of faith to the kail pot and the button hole, is not very encouraging to the cause of the German-Catholic church. The people have been schooled, drilled, and governed out of all self-respect and self-action. If the Prussian government, and, in imitation of it, all the other German governments, had not adopted the functionary system of interference in all social action, of superintendence and control over all individual movement in the application of industry, property, and free judgment, the people would at this crisis have been in a state to think and act for them-

selves, instead of being in a state of childish pupilage, under functionaries in all social movement, and under the priesthood of the church of Rome in all religious action in the Catholic body. They would have been self-educated by the management of their own interests and affairs, self-acting and self-thinking, even if they were ignorant in school-taught knowledge; and the great disruption in Scotland from the State church shows that a people may be left to their own good sense to preserve the most perfect social order in the midst even of the most exciting religious discord. The time has undoubtedly come when the German monarchs might have thrown off the subjection of their own subjects to a foreign power, and have put down a hierarchy in the land independent of them, but the great mass of their Catholic subjects are not educated up to this movement. The governments must take the initiative, and encourage and promote the schism, or the spark struck by Ronge will gradually expire. The class even which has taken it up is that which is the least susceptible of religious zeal in the German social body, because the religious habits of the higher classes are lax, the tendency to the innocent animal gratifications is great, and indignation at gross

superstition and ignorance, rather than any more enlightened religious views, appears to be the moving spring in their secession. We hear of no sacrifice of money to support ministers, no half million raised, as in Scotland by the same class, for building churches, and endowing preachers. The total number of congregations is supposed to be about a hundred and twenty. The zeal in the German-Catholic congregations is strong enough to part with doctrine, but not to part with money. Few of the congregations have made any adequate and permanent provision for their pastors. The opening of congregations, introducing and inducting ministers, administering the sacrament, marrying, baptizing, and preaching where congregations are forming, are performed over a great part of the south and middle of Germany, by Pastor Ronge, assisted by Pastor Kerbler, Pastor Licht, and a few others—all priests formerly in the church of Rome, men of the highest character, and some of them of high standing in their order before they seceded.

In the north, about Dantzig and Posen, a similar band, with Czerzki, go about to promulgate the doctrines of the German-Catholic church. These men are impressive, eloquent preachers; their hearers speak with warmth of their simple,

earnest, affecting addresses. It is through these men that the life which is wanting will come—if it is to come—into the new Catholic church—that religious knowledge, religious zeal, religious spirit, and religious habits will be infused into the congregations. Without these, they will never be a church. They will only form a social structure similar to a church, right and good in its principles and intentions, perhaps, and even useful as a social structure, but altogether vague in doctrine and belief. They will only establish, without these, a sort of Freemasonry in the Christian religion, embracing all men of all opinions however inconsistent with each other or with truth, by using only an unmeaning or ambiguous formula, masonic word, or confession of faith, as the test of brotherhood.

By some it may be considered that this would be a great advantage—that a national church covering all sects, churches, and doctrines, must be the very thing to suit modern society. In Germany, many approve of the German-Catholic church on this account; and, it is said, some Protestants even have joined it as a kind of universal church doing away with the unhappy differences between Protestants and Papists. But what is good for every thing, the old proverb tells us, is

good for nothing. A doctrine or code of principles that equally embraces the true and the false, whether it be in religion or philosophy, in morals, politics, or private dealings, is not the very thing for society, but on the contrary would cast men loose from all regard for the true or the false, the right or the wrong, in thinking and acting.

CONCLUSION.

Christianity seems to be resolving itself insensibly into two great divisions—a Christianity pure, spiritual, scriptural, and altogether purged from ceremonial forms of worship, and external influences of human power either of church or state, and of which the present type is in Scotland—and a Christianity altogether ceremonial, and founded on the imaginative and æsthetic elements in our mental constitution rather than on our reasoning faculties,—a religion of show, relics, pictures, forms, saint-worship, pilgrimages, dresses, music, and church solemnities, and of which the type is the Church of Rome. The halfway houses of a Lutheran Church, a Church of England, a Puseyite Church, a German Church, all repudiating the doctrines of the Church of Rome, yet all retaining more or less of the superstitious

ceremonies and usages which can only be defended as legitimate deductions from those doctrines they repudiate, or repudiating the ceremonies and usages, yet retaining the doctrines which justify them, must tumble down in time, for they carry in them the dry rot in their timbers from their first erection. The European mind will take shelter in one or other of the two extreme divisions of Christianity, and undoubtedly at last in that which is purest, most simple, most scriptural, most adapted to the intelligence of enlightened men as the suitable worship of their Creator.

We have no sanguine expectation, when we sum up the probabilities for and against the success of the German-Catholic Church, its own internal defects of doctrine, and consider the mind, habits, education, and social condition of the people of Germany, that it is to prove a heavy blow to the Church of Rome. It is a blow, but it is the blow of a child, without force, energy of purpose, or right direction.

The pilgrimage to the holy coat at Trèves, — the miraculous cure of the young countess Drosti Vischering's lameness, — the attempt, whether it be successful or not, to raise in Germany a church,

independent of the Church of Rome and its hierarchy, and free from the superstitions which they have engrafted on Christianity — are not merely curious and instructive incidents in the history of the nineteenth century — instructive, by teaching us too clearly to be denied, that the boasted advance of society by the educational measures of a government under which men do not enjoy civil and political liberty, is a bubble; but they furnish us with reflections applicable to our own domestic policy. Ireland, with its Catholic population of 6,620,000 souls — its upper classes not merely strangers to the lower, but the two classes in a secret animosity and bitterness of feeling toward each other, may be compared to Prussia, with its Catholic population of 5,617,020 souls — its upper classes merged into a body of functionaries doing duty over the people like the commissioned and non-commissioned officers of a regiment over the privates, ordering, directing, or superintending every thought, word, and deed. The proportion of the Catholic to the Protestant population of Prussia, the total population being 14,928,501, is considerably above one third, and in the united kingdoms of Great Britain considerably less than one fourth. Steam by sea and land is amalgamating the material interests, the habits, and

ideas of the most distinct and distant portions of the British population so rapidly, that in another half century the difference between Irish, and English, and Scotch, will be reduced to that which a faulty legislation, not keeping pace with the times, but retaining old and now unnecessary distinctions or legal customs, may keep alive. Religion, however, is a great and permanent element of difference. The Catholic population of Prussia, under an autocratic government, and a semi-military organisation of civil society, gives no rule by which we can reasonably judge of what may be the future and not very distant condition of the British Catholic population acted upon by the great and increasing intercourse, diffusion of profitable labour, and of common tastes, habits, and ideas, now going on through the agency and results of steam power. Steam-boats and railroads, bringing the Irish people by hundreds of thousands within the influence of English wages, English habits, tastes, and ideas, are the efficient opponents of O'Connell's repeal agitation. In a country in which men enjoy at least civil freedom, mobs, crowds, monster-meetings, do not at all imply rebellion, or even disaffection. Curiosity, love of fun, love of mischief, make men congregate, especially when there is a want of steady

employment; but they disperse, as they meet, without any danger to the State, or any thought of it. The only danger is of a breach of the peace, excited, perhaps, often by the too great precautions of the government to prevent it, and by the dislike of the police force, established on a footing too military for the habits of the people. Left to themselves, and to ordinary local constables appointed from among the people, the uproarious meetings of the Irish at wakes and fairs would probably end in a few broken heads, and the ferocious character which they assume from having a common enemy in a constabulary force to oppose, would subside, probably, as such meetings have done in England and Scotland, into scenes of petty riot and tumult, which a shower of rain disperses more effectually than the riot act. It is needless interference and precaution which often gives birth to the very excess it is intended to quell. England and Scotland are at present the two schools in which the Irish are being educated. It is but of late, since the cheap fare of a shilling, or even sixpence, by the steam vessels, brings the Irish labourer to the Clyde or the Mersey, that the influence of intercourse has begun to appear on the character of the Irish people. The appearances are promising. It is

noticed in some of the Evidence on the State of the Poor in Scotland, that in Edinburgh, and, if we mistake not, the same observation is made, or holds good, in Glasgow and Dundee, the Irish immigrants are by no means in the lowest ranks of the poor in that city. The Scotch themselves are the poorest of the poor in its population, and the Irish are found very generally to be hucksters, small shopkeepers, dealers in pigs, carriers of fish or garden stuffs through the poorest quarters of the city, and in employments above absolute pauperism. They are evidently not lazy when they can get work, nor idle when they do not, but endeavour to shift for themselves, and they make a living in many ingenious ways when employment is scarce, surpassing the labouring poor of England or Scotland in this kind of activity and energy. If their stay in England or Scotland has only been for a spell at harvest work for a few weeks, they return home with new ideas, new tastes, and improved habits. They have been at a school worth ten thousand lay-colleges for the Catholic population, and are educating themselves for taking a rational social position. In this transition-crisis of the Irish nation it would be very doubtful policy for Government to step in, and fix, by endowment of the Roman Catholic

church in Ireland, the social condition of the people, as far as the machinery of the church acts on their condition, in all future ages. The endowment of schools and colleges for the lower and middle classes of the lay Roman Catholic population, and even of Maynooth for the Catholic priesthood, is a totally distinct question, as stated by Sir Robert Peel and Lord Stanley, from the endowment of the Catholic church in Ireland. It is considered no doubt as a preliminary step to such a measure; but the measure, if contemplated at all by the British government, has never been discussed on its political bearings. It has been considered in its religious but not in its social phase. The supposed preliminary step of offering the means of education to classes whose ignorance is dangerous in a religious view, as the opponents of these educational endowments admit, to their own souls, and, in a political view, as all men admit, to the peace and well-being of society, cannot be opposed, as far as it goes, even if it be really a preliminary step, on Christian and reasonable grounds. To perpetuate ignorance is to perpetuate the church of Rome. Knowledge is a key stronger than St. Peter's. The mistake of the educational system of Prussia is expecting the key to work of itself, and not giving the people

the habits, through freedom of action, of applying it. The university of Bonn, in which Catholic and Protestant students and professors are equally admitted, is situated in the very centre of the pilgrimage movement. The government schools and colleges for all classes of the population abound in the very provinces in which it arose. We must not, therefore, have any high expectations from the educational endowments in Ireland. A single railway, with the wages, work, and intercourse attending its construction, will do more than fifty endowed colleges in educating and raising the social condition of the Irish people. At the time when the greatest amalgamation-influences that ever were applied to two countries—that of steam navigation, that of railroad communications, and that of enormous capital laid out among the labouring class of the poorer country by the richer—are on the eve of working, and the oldest of them, steam navigation, has scarcely yet been in full operation, it is evident that an administration, which certainly cannot be accused of want of caution, or of any extreme boldness in its measures, can have no intention whatever of fixing the social, political, and religious relations of Ireland by the endowment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. What is held out as a pre-

liminary is a final step— final as to the direction to be taken by Government, viz. the educating the lower and middle classes of the Catholic population by schools or colleges.

The great fault committed in taking this step has been, consulting the Irish Catholic hierarchy about it. In Maynooth college, established for the education of the Catholic priesthood, the Catholic bishops were entitled to have a directing voice. In the establishment of colleges for the education of lay members of the Catholic faith, Government was fulfilling a duty to its subjects, and by consulting the Catholic hierarchy, or being swayed by their opinions in the appointment of professors, or other academical arrangements, was in effect turning over its duty and its power to a party. The universities of Bonn, Tübingen, and many others on the Continent, are mixed universities, in which Catholic and Protestant students and professors are on equal footing. All universities in which the tuition is professorial, as in the foreign and Scotch universities, and not tutorial, as in Oxford and Cambridge, are practically mixed as to religion. The student pays for his ticket of admission to the course of lectures on the science he wishes to study, is examined from time to time and directed in his progress; but, even at Edin-

burgh and Glasgow, the student hitherto might have been of the Church of England, or of the Roman Catholic church. Nothing was required or implied that compromised his individual religious faith. The rejection of the motion in Parliament for repealing the tests in the Scotch universities will no doubt revive obsolete usages, and introduce an exclusive religious character into the class-rooms and the chairs of those seminaries: but it will ruin them as places of education for all the youth of every sect or country; and it was by that character they flourished. If Government had established the four colleges proposed, on its own judgment, and, in fulfilment of its own duties, had selected abroad and at home the best professors, whether Catholic or Protestant, it could obtain, and had thrown open the doors to all students, Catholic or Protestant, on moderate terms, the colleges would in time have been filled, as Bonn and other mixed universities are filled; and Protestants and Catholics, educated together, would have lived in amity with each other. Government appears to have adopted the unhappy policy of educating each religious division of the population apart, and by itself. The Church of England is to have her magnificent educational institutions fenced off from all

British subjects who are not of the Church of England. The Roman Catholic church is to have not merely her priest-seminaries under her own management, but to have a voice and influence, not conceded to her in Prussia, or any country of mixed population on the Continent, in the educational establishments for the lay body of the Catholic population ; and they too are to be educated apart, with all the feelings of religious animosity kept alive by the difference, the competition, and the non-intercourse between different universities. The Scotch residuary church must, in consistency, apply the test it has got confirmed, and banish from its halls the professors and students of the Free Church. Here again the same wretched policy, instead of amalgamating the people of different religious views, is breeding them up in separate divisions standing aloof from each other.

Government might have trusted to the common sense of the Irish Catholics of the middle class for availing themselves, in spite of the influence of their priests, of educational institutions brought home to their doors at an easy expense, and in which professors and pupils of their own faith were on an equal footing with others. They do so in Prussia, where bigotry is certainly not at

its minimum among the Catholic population, why should they not have done so in Ireland? The Catholic clergy acquiesce there in the government appointments to lay Catholic professorships, and in mixed universities: why should they not have done so in Ireland?

Sir Robert Peel may say more truly than any man who ever held office, “Save me from my friends, and I can deal with my adversaries.” An article in the last Quarterly Review, Number CLI., imputes to him, in the most friendly way, the intention of endowing the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, and vindicates his political consistency in adopting this great Whig measure. The consistency or inconsistency of Sir Robert Peel is a question of very secondary importance to the country to the great questions — Whether this be the suitable time for such a measure — now when the most powerful influences which have ever appeared in Ireland have suddenly sprung up, and are beginning to work on the social, material, and intellectual condition of the Irish people — influences of which no human wisdom can foresee the results? — Whether now at this turning point, which is sometimes a point as strongly marked in the career of a nation as of an individual, it would be wise and prudent policy

to fix down for ever, by endowment, an ecclesiastical establishment which, for three hundred years or more, has kept Ireland in a social, material, and intellectual condition, if not approaching to barbarism, at least far below the condition of the rest of the empire?—Whether endowment would cure the inherent evils of this establishment, or only add to its powers and numbers? How, too, could the Roman Catholic church of Ireland be endowed? It consists at present of four archbishops and twenty-three bishops nominated by the Pope, of 2145 parochial clergy nominated by the bishops, of forty-six deans and archdeacons nominated by the cardinal protector at Rome. The whole of this body of clergy is supported, not as it is in general erroneously supposed, by the voluntary contributions of their flocks, and which drain upon the substance of the people would necessarily cease upon suitable provision for each being made by government endowment; but by involuntary payments inherent in the very nature of the Roman Catholic faith. Easter and Christmas offerings must be made, masses for the dead, prayers for the living, extreme unction for the dying; all that is now paid must be paid, and for the sake of the giver, or of those for whom it is given, not for the sake of the receiver and for his

support. That is but an incidental, secondary object. It is not, as in the Free Church of Scotland, or in a voluntary church, the primary object of the contributions. It is to save his own soul, or the souls of those he loved, from Purgatory, that the Catholic gives, and his giving is the essential. If his parish priest were as richly endowed as the Protestant Bishop of Clogher, he would still give to the utmost penny for all church offices what he gives now, for it is not to a sustentation fund he is giving, but to his own salvation. The Roman Catholic religion must cease to be, if this sacred duty, as the Catholic of every class esteems it, is to cease, and to be considered a mere voluntary contribution for the support of his priest, which may be given up when his priest is otherwise provided for. We see in the articles of dissent from the church of Rome, from all the congregations of the German-Catholic church, that the dispensation of all church offices by the minister free of expense, without fees or payments, and equally to all, is expressly mentioned as one of the requirements which they insist on, the payments for these offices one of the grievances they will no longer tolerate; yet their parochial Roman Catholic clergy are endowed in Prussia by the state, and paid in proportion to the Protestant

clergy. The endowment of the Catholic clergy would not relieve the people, but only furnish the church of Rome with funds for supporting another body of 2200 priests in the country. The Catholic bishops could not renounce or make a tariff diminishing those payments, because they are held essential by the giver to his own religious welfare, in whatever way they are applied. The people would not be relieved from these onerous and impoverishing payments, if they are as onerous, impoverishing, and oppressive to the lower classes as the Irish landholders represent them to be, by any provision made for their clergy. They must first be relieved from the superstition which makes them believe that such payments are salutary to their own souls in a future state. It is besides a gross exaggeration, equalled only by the credulity which believes it, that six millions and a half of people are impoverished by the sustentation of two-and-twenty hundred single men. Tithes, we can understand, may be onerous, oppressive, and impoverishing to a people, because they take not only a tenth of the fruits of the earth, but a tenth of the labour and industry employed in raising those fruits, and make no return for it. The tenth bushel of potatoes taken in tithe takes the tenth day's labour of the working man em-

ployed in planting, hoeing, and digging up that bushel of potatoes. That evidently must impoverish a labouring peasantry employed only, like the Irish, in husbandry on their own account as cottar-tenants, because it takes from them for nothing one tenth of their time and labour, as well as one tenth of the fruits of the piece of land for which they are paying an exorbitant rent. But the voluntary giving away what they have got, the bestowing a portion, be it more or less, of their realised substance for the support of their priests, can have no such ruinous effects; they are not giving their time and labour for nothing, but are spending the realised fruits of it in the way that pleases them. The class on whom they spend their realised property is but an additional wheel in its circulation. We see no ruinous effects arising from the voluntary sustentation of their own clergy among the Wesleyans, and the Dissenters of every sect in England, or among the old Seceders, or the new Free Church congregations in Scotland. On the contrary, it is not saying too much to say, that those who, by their voluntary contributions, support their own ministers and church, be the sect what it will, are invariably the most industrious, thriving, and intellectual men of their class in society. The

reason is obvious. If they were not thinking men, of staid reflective character, men capable of sacrificing animal gratification for higher objects, and of doing what they consider to be right, and also men of prudent conduct, saving or earning the means to do what they deem right, they would belong to no religious body which cost them money for its support. It is the great moral distinction of the British people in the present age, that they are almost the only people in Europe on whom opinion and principle have such weight and influence, and are applied to real life so immediately and powerfully, that action follows conviction in all social movement, and men make sacrifices of their money, time, labour, ease, luxuries, and enjoyments, for the sake of what they deem right in politics, in religion, or in any of the great interests of society. This is a great advance in comparison of the social state of those countries in which all is done by endowment and establishment. If we had no endowed church establishments in England or Scotland, it would undoubtedly, in our present state of society, be a retrograde step to create them. This is admitted by the most strenuous defenders of the establishments; for their argument is, not that they ought to exist, but that existing, and being endowed

with property and power from the earliest times, they ought to be supported in their existence by the state. To endow and set up in this country a new establishment is, however, a very different question in policy from supporting an old. It is evident that, even supposing it sound policy to endow the Catholic clergy of Ireland, and to give them an acknowledged official status and influence as a national establishment, the government must have a control, a veto in the appointments. Without this a state within the state would be created, one liable, in a country of civil freedom like ours, to be used on every popular agitation against, as readily as for, the most wholesome measures of the government. It is no answer to this reasonable objection to the establishment of an endowed Roman Catholic church in Ireland, and necessarily in England and Scotland also, to say that our sovereign would receive from the Pope the same concordat, the same powers and control which other Protestant sovereigns on the Continent who have Catholic subjects, have obtained. The government of this country stands on a different basis; and the same powers and control which may be sufficient and available to these governments, would not be so to ours. They are founded on autocratic power above law, supported by a

military and functionary system. The turbulent agitator can at once be removed. O'Connell would have been in chains in Spandau, if Silesia, instead of Ireland, had been the scene of his repeal agitation. But our government is founded on laws, and public opinion, superior to the direct power of government. It is by the selection of fit men for situations in which turbulent spirits might be dangerous, not by any removal or infringement of their personal rights, that our government can alone act; and this selection our government cannot have unless the education of the Catholic priesthood, and a veto on clerical appointments, were in the hands of some branch of it, such as a Catholic minister of state for ecclesiastical affairs. Prussia, which with its mixed Catholic and Protestant population comes nearest to the circumstances of Great Britain, has a minister of state, Eichhorn, for clerical, educational, and medical affairs, and two subordinate ministers, Von Ludenberg and Von Duesberg, the first having in his department the ecclesiastical affairs of the Protestant church, the educational affairs, and the medical, viz. the appointment of doctors and surgeons throughout the country; the other, Von Duesberg, having the clerical affairs of the Roman Catholic church. The expenditure of this depart-

ment of the state in 1844 was 3,119,940 thalers. Yet with this state-control, and an autocratic power, the Prussian government is not able to keep in check, and within the limits which the safety of the state may fairly require, the established and endowed clergy of the church of Rome in her own dominions. The million and a half of pilgrims assembled at Trèves by Bishop Arnoldi, and assembled in spite of the law, might, if it had so pleased their fanatic priests, have with equal ease been assembled at Potsdam. Will any British ministry venture to place their sovereign in the same position? The monster-meeting at Trèves and the monster-meeting at Kildare may be compared together. In Prussia the will of the king is every thing, the voice of the people nothing — not even a voice, for it is not allowed to make itself heard. Yet here the endowed and embodied clergy of the church of Rome can set the law of the autocratic government at defiance, and gather together a million and a half of people in processions, although processions are forbidden by law; and not only do this in the most educated provinces of the kingdom, as if in scorn of the educational measures for putting down superstition by school-drilling the people, but do it with impunity, and cannot be touched or called in

question for it by the civil authority. Bishop Arnoldi is responsible only to his ecclesiastical superiors in this pilgrimage affair, and is in reality a member of a state within the state, and can beard his autocratic sovereign as well as his predecessors in the middle ages. In Ireland, low as the physical condition of the Irish peasantry may be in respect of food, clothing, and lodging, low as their habits may be in respect of industry, ignorant as they may be in respect to school learning and religion, they are men in a much higher social and intellectual condition than the educated Catholic population of Prussia. They assemble in their monster-meetings, not to worship a holy coat, but for a social and political object, the Repeal of the Union. They meet, listen, discuss, and disperse, without any breach of the laws of the country, in meeting and discussion. They, and their leaders, are equally subject to the law if it be in any way transgressed. There is safety in their freedom. But in Prussia there is danger in the monster-meeting at Trèves, however harmless and innocent in itself, because it is a breach in the system and principle of the government—a demonstration by a power, which is independent of the government, of its commanding influence in the country. Will any ministry venture to

create such a power in Ireland ? At present the Catholic priests are, like other British subjects, under the laws of the land as enacted by Parliament. Embodied and endowed as a distinct establishment under the see of Rome, responsible to their own ecclesiastical superior at Rome only, they are no longer two-and-twenty hundred individuals supported voluntarily by six millions and a half of people as their clergy, but they are a body of great moral influence, a new social and political power, a new interest in the country, and yet independent of its government. The influence, it may be alleged, exists now — it would be nothing new that would be created. But if we look at the reality, we find this is not the case. The Catholic priests now have no more social or political weight than any other ministers of a voluntary church — the individual has none but what as an individual he acquires in his ministerial office, and exercises over individuals. As an acknowledged, endowed establishment, they would obtain collectively a new moral influence and status as a body — would become a new social power and interest in the country. The working of this power in countries with a mixed population like Ireland has not been so sweet, smooth, and peaceful as to warrant a trial of it. In

Prussia, with a government of despotic power, and a strong state arrangement for ecclesiastical management, the veto of the state on unsuitable clerical appointments is not yet satisfactorily settled, the peace and order of the country and the positive laws of the government are broken with impunity by a fanatic bishop put into office by a foreign power, and whom the government could neither select at first, nor dismiss or punish afterwards. If the Irish Catholic peasantry be in the state of ignorance, superstition, and barbarism in which they are represented to be, would a prudent ministry put a similar power in the hands of such leaders without check or control? The Irish Catholic priesthood is acknowledged to be under-educated for their position even as priests, and still more as citizens or members of society—the grant to Maynooth is made upon this very assumption—and yet it is proposed to give the whole moral influence of an endowed, acknowledged state establishment to these ill-educated members of society over six millions and a half of people, and with no control over them! The concordat of Prussia, or the agreement with the Pope relative to clerical appointments and the veto of the government, is evidently ineffective, as the appointment of such a firebrand as Dr.

Arnoldi to the see of Trèves proves, and as the distress and misery inflicted by the Catholic priests by their doctrine and practice in cases of mixed marriages, prove every day in the domestic circles of Prussian subjects. The whole population of Prussia would be Catholic in a period not very distant if all children born in mixed marriages must, as the church of Rome insists, be brought up in the Catholic faith, under the penalty of denial to the Catholic parent of all the sacraments and church offices which the Catholic thinks essential to salvation. The conscience of the Holy Father, it was openly stated in the controversies on this subject with the Prussian government, could not allow any relaxation on this point, and that children of whom one of the parents belonged to the true church should be brought up heretics. To this impudent pretension, worthy of the middle ages, the powerful autocrat of Prussia had not the energy, or had not the will, to oppose the contra-pretension, that with him it was also a matter of conscience that all such children of mixed marriages should be brought up in the true Protestant faith. The tendencies of the royal mind were, in fact, Catholic, or, at least, not at all Protestant. The name and ritual of the Lutheran, Calvinistic, or Protestant church were about being

abolished when this controversy began, and a new Evangelical church, approaching in ceremonial the church of Rome, was about being established. The late king would have been a religious man if he had had a religion. He could find none to fit him just at that time ; the people were cast loose from the old or Lutheran church by royal edict, and the church of Rome seized the moment when the king was doubtful and the people careless, to carry practically into effect this exclusion from church benefits and services of the Catholic parent in mixed marriages, if the children were not all brought up in the Catholic faith. However careless and indifferent Protestants in Germany may be about religion, no man can submit to have a religion imposed upon his children to which he cannot give his belief. This source of domestic misery in private life is opened, and is pouring out affliction every day in the circles in which, the population being mixed, and Catholics and Protestants living together, mixed marriages have occurred. No good government could permit such a social evil. Has our government any guarantee that this very pretension in cases of mixed marriages would not be added to the many other calamities of Ireland, if the Church of Rome were endowed ? It will be said we hear little or nothing

of any such misery arising in Ireland from this cause now: why should it arise then? Because now the Irish priests are not an endowed body, but are individuals supported, like other unendowed ministers, by their congregations, and can do nothing contrary to the common sense and right natural feelings of mankind without suffering in their personal influence over their congregations, and even in their means of support. Endow them, give them other sources of income, and the pretension which now they cannot afford to bring forward, would be heard from end to end of Ireland; the great means of allaying the hatred and bitter feeling between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland — their intermarriages — would be put a stop to, and the domestic peace of families would be disturbed.

It is urged in the article of the Quarterly Review above alluded to, that the endowment of the Catholic church in Ireland would amount to no very important sum in the vast expenditure of the British empire, and therefore the Catholic church ought to be endowed. 250,000*l.*, or at the utmost 300,000*l.* yearly, would, it is stated, defray the expenses of the endowment — a sum scarcely greater than the auction duty remitted in the late reduction of taxes. But it is the policy

of the measure, its necessity, its consequences—not its expense—that is the question at issue. The smallness of the expense to the community at large is an argument against it, not in its favour, because this shows that there is no real necessity for it. If so paltry a sum as 250,000*l.* or 300,000*l.* be all the expense of making a suitable provision for the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, it is altogether absurd to maintain that six millions and a half of people are impoverished by this trifling yearly drain upon their substance, are reduced to misery by it, while in the naturally much poorer country of Scotland one million of their fellow-subjects are voluntarily raising 300,000*l.* yearly for the support of their church, and the whole body of English Dissenters of all denominations are supporting their ministers at a vastly greater sacrifice than eleven-pence halfpenny a head, which is about the amount of this impoverishing drain on the Irish Catholic population. On what principle—for it is a question of principle, not of expense—is one class of British subjects to be relieved of the burden of supporting their clergy, and not another? And how is this relief to be administered? Is it to be a *regium donum* of 300,000*l.* yearly, to be paid to the heads of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in

Ireland, to be by them applied to the sustentation of their parochial clergy ? In that case it would be only an apparent, not a real relief. The parochial clergy would apparently be sustained and paid out of this yearly fund, but the people would pay the same as before for masses, remissions, offerings, &c., because these payments are essential to the spiritual welfare of the giver, according to his religious views and feelings, independently altogether of the application of them to the support of the priest. The money may be applied to adorning a relic, gilding an image, furnishing out a procession, or supporting the priest : it is the giving that is the meritorious soul-saving act. No stipulation can be made with the higher clergy of the church of Rome that such contributions shall cease in Ireland, because they are of the very nature of the Roman Catholic faith, and are pious sacrifices. But if they are not to cease, where would be the relief ? The *regium donum* of 300,000*l.* a year would only be, in effect, a subscription for the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion, as the same sum that is now raised, and applied to the support of the priest would, from the very nature of the religion, be raised as before, and applied to the support of an assistant priest. It would only

have the effect of doubling the number of the priests. The grant to Maynooth even will probably only have the effect of increasing the number of students, not of raising their habits and intellectual and physical condition, if care be not taken by government to have the money applied in the way, and on the objects, for which it was granted.

But from whence is this endowment to be taken? Principle is every thing in it. Although the sum is small compared to many other items of government expenditure, it must be provided for justly. The smallness of the sum only aggravates the feeling of injustice, if it be levied from those who ought not to be made to pay it, because it has not the excuse of an absolute necessity. The religious repugnance of the great body of Protestants of all denominations to be taxed, or made to contribute in any shape or way, directly or indirectly, to the support of the church of Rome, cannot be overlooked. They are opposed to this endowment being taken out of their pockets, not for its expense, but on religious principle. They, the most respectable of the middle class, with an unanimity which it must be allowed is the voice of the nation, protest against what they consider sinful — the contributing to

the support of a church which in their consciences they believe to be anti-christian and idolatrous. Is Sir Robert Peel the man who could force this great mass of the community, against their religious convictions, to pay, out of their taxes, an endowment to the Roman Catholic church, because he may, by sorry shifts, contrive to get a majority of their representatives in Parliament to vote for it? There are most important cities and districts—Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield, and almost all Scotland—in which a great majority of the people of the middle classes would offer a passive resistance to all taxation—would, like the sect of Quakers, allow the tax-gatherer to distrain their goods, but would pay no taxes, if an item so repugnant to their religious principles as the endowment of the Roman Catholic church out of their taxes appeared in the budget. It is not out of their pockets, not out of the general taxation of the country, that this endowment can be taken. To the endowment of Maynooth, and of the four proposed colleges for the Irish laity, the same religious objection does not apply. It is by education, and by mixing with his fellow-men freely in schools and colleges, that the Irish Catholic is to be enlightened. To the simple educational measure no fair objection can

be made; but the endowment of the Roman Catholic church is a measure of a very different character. From whence, then, can the endowment be taken? The writer in the Quarterly Review, who tells us that the endowment of the colleges for the education of the Catholic priesthood and laity is but a preliminary step to the endowment of the Irish Roman Catholic church, and would be worthless without it, tells us also that it would be spoliation to take it out of the monstrous revenues of the Established Church of Ireland. Is there no such thing as a spoliation of the people? The Protestant population in Ireland belonging to the Established Church is reckoned to be only between eight and nine hundred thousand souls, and between two and three millions sterling yearly are said to be enjoyed by the body of clergy of this church establishment, many of whom have not a Protestant congregation, some not even a single Protestant in their parishes besides their own families. Would it be spoliation to take the endowment of the Roman Catholic church out of the ill-earned revenues of this monster-establishment? If the smallness of the sum required be a good argument for taking it out of the general taxes of the country, it is a still better argument for taking

it out of the general revenues of the Irish church establishment; for the amount bears a much smaller proportion to the surplus income there — surplus as to any utility — than to any surplus of needful revenue that the country can boast of. As a question of property and spoliation, the church establishment, or clergy, whether Catholic or Protestant, has only an usufruct, a contingent interest, as beneficiaries, or life-renters, in an estate belonging to the community, and which the community may claim, and has before now claimed, and turned over from one establishment to another, from the Roman Catholic to the Protestant in the sixteenth century, and which it may reverse now in the nineteenth, if the good of the community require it, reserving only to the existing incumbents their life-rent usufruct of the estate. If the property belong to the church in the same sense as any estate belongs to a private gentleman, then clearly the church of Rome is the true and original proprietor, and in equity ought to be endowed, not merely out of it, but with it. The spoliation was committed against the church of Rome, and if it is to be re-established and rehabilitated as a church acknowledged by the state, it has in equity an undeniable right to the whole endowment of the

Protestant church of Ireland, and not merely to a paltry pittance out of it. But the government of the country has the right to apply this estate to the religious and educational uses of the community, for to the community it belongs, and not to any church establishment ; and the only question is, whether the government will be allowed by the country to apply it to the endowment of the Roman Catholic church. The voice of the nation is against it.


But what will become of Ireland if the six millions and a half of her Catholic population are not relieved, by the endowment of their clergy, from eleven-pence halfpenny yearly of voluntary payment for their support ? Ireland, with or without Catholic endowment, will remain what she is— poor, wretched, and turbulent — until the people obtain employment, property, and with these, improved habits, and a direct interest in peace and the support of law. Endowed establishments cannot give these ; education cannot. It is very possible, that small as the burden appears which each Catholic has to pay for the support of his church, it may be felt more than any other burden, because it is the last drop that makes the cup run over ; and this last burden is in an irritating contrast to the extravagantly paid

and unnecessarily great establishment of the Protestant church in Ireland. It is not by endowing, but by disendowing, that this feeling is to be allayed, and the burden equalised on either side, to the satisfaction of the patient animal the public. A reduction of the Protestant establishment to what is sufficient for the religious wants of the Protestant population, and a judicious expenditure of the surplus revenues of the monster-church, would pacify and improve Ireland much more than the endowment of a new body of clergy, and the consequent increase of their numbers. Ireland is already sufficiently priest-ridden.

The great influx of capital into Ireland which the railroad schemes will occasion, the improvement and wealth which they will diffuse among the labouring classes, will no doubt form a new era in the condition of the people, one at which it would be injudicious in government to settle establishments or endowments, or undertake changes in the social body, upon views taken before these mighty influences were thought of, or can be in operation. But of what benefit will this employment and wealth be to the people if their earnings, and the property acquired by their labour, be not made their own ? If the tenement of the labourer for which he now pays six pounds be raised imme-

diately to twelve pounds, of what benefit will his earnings and industry be to him? He will only be working to put money into the pockets of his absentee landlord. A fixity of rent is the only measure which can restore Ireland to a sound social condition. It would be a violation of the rights of property; but there are rights and duties to which the rights of the proprietors of the land are but secondary. The fixity of rents, and the permanency of holding, would probably be obtained by an enactment that no distress for rent can be legally made unless the tenant is sitting under a lease of at least fourteen years, and by establishing a maximum of rent in each district upon the basis of the value of the land, as ascertained in the course of the valuations for the railroad lines, and the prices to be paid to the proprietors of the land for what is taken by the railroad proprietors. Such a fixity and maximum would unquestionably be a great violation of the established usages or rights of property, but so is the taking of the land altogether from the proprietors by Act of Parliament for the construction of a railroad. It is for the public good. The principle is established, that the rights or usages under which property is held must give way before objects of public good. Here the object is, much more clearly than in the

construction of any railroad, the public good; and it is not the use of his property which is restrained, and for which the proprietor is justly entitled to compensation from the railroad proprietors, the public, or others, who may receive the benefit, but it is the abuse of his property which is restrained, and for which he is no more entitled to compensation than if he had turned his property into a nuisance — a pestilential marsh or a noxious manufactory — which for the public good is put down. The land of Ireland is a noxious manufactory of rents for absentee landlords, and the legislature is on principle entitled to interfere, and stop the abuse, for the general good of the community.



POSTSCRIPT

TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE German-Catholic church has only been in existence about fifteen months; its first congregation, that of Schneidemühl, dates its Confession of Faith on the 19th of October, 1844, and already it has extended itself from the Baltic to the Lake of Constance, from the Vistula to the Rhine. The middle and upper classes, the educated, of the Roman Catholic population of Germany, welcome this Reformation of the nineteenth century as an emancipation of the public mind from the abuses of the church of Rome, its superstitions, its interference, through the power of its hierarchy, with the most sacred ties of social life and the most secret intimacies of domestic happiness. The governments the most opposed to this movement, from religious or political bigotry, Saxony, Baden, Prussia, Hanover, are awed into silence, or passive dislike, by the sudden and general expression of public opinion. Could the most sanguine have anticipated so great a progress in so short a time?

Such appears, on a cursory view, to be the progress made by the German-Catholic church since the first edition of this account of it was published in autumn. But, as time rolls on, first impressions pass away, and we naturally examine with care the actual position and solidity of the object before us.

In one sense, the progress of the German-Catholic church has been great beyond example in the history of the human mind. As a social and intellectual movement, an expression of the educated public mind on the insufficiency of the church of Rome to meet its religious wants in the nineteenth century, on the incompatibility of the interference of her priesthood, by auricular confession, with the sacred privacy of domestic life, on the moral evil of celibacy to the priesthood and to the community, on the ignorance, superstition, and idolatry of saint worship, relic worship, and remissions of sin; on all these points affecting the social, intellectual, and moral state of mankind in the present age, the progress of the German-Catholic church has been rapid, vast, and worthy of the enlightened, cultivated state of the middle and upper classes of the population of Germany.

In another and higher sense the progress of the

German Catholic church has been nothing at all. As a Christian church established on scriptural doctrines, displacing on sound scriptural grounds the superstitions, errors, false doctrines, and assumptions of the Church of Rome, and, in their stead, building up a pure spiritual Christianity in the minds of men, no progress at all has been made by the well-meaning, zealous, but evidently incapable men who commenced the erection of a German-Catholic church. They are building without a foundation and without a plan. No basis of a common doctrine in religious belief and observance, derived from Scripture, and uniting all the scattered members into one whole, has been laid to support the structure they are erecting. The confessions of faith, and observances founded on doctrine, of each congregation, or group of congregations, of the German-Catholic church, differ from the faith and observances of its neighbours, nominally also of the same church, as widely as the Lutheran church differs from the church of Rome. We have given examples, in the body of the work, of confessions of faith solemnly drawn up, and accepted, that, for instance, of Schneidemühl, which adopts the doctrine of transubstantiation and the real presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as fully as

that doctrine is enunciated by the church of Rome; and of other confessions of faith again, that, for instance, of Breslau and of Leipsic, which declare as explicitly as the Presbyterian church of Scotland that the elements and the celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are commemorative and symbolical only. How are two such discordant doctrines to be brought under one doctrine, under one common church, unless that one doctrine or church be so stretched and attenuated to cover the most opposite, inconsistent, and mutually destructive principles or acceptations of the scriptural meaning, that it has no truth or scriptural Christianity left in it, is a mere empty formula or name, not a Christian doctrine or a Christian church? It is easy to devise a name to cover all sects and denominations of Christian believers from the monk in his cell to the Cameronian on the mountain side—such a name as the Universal Church, or the Christian Union, might do; and occasions may occur on which all men calling themselves Christians may unite for some great object, such as the abolition of slavery; but the wisdom of very often, and unless upon rare and great emergencies, throwing one and the same cloak over truth and error, or what men believe to be truth and error, in reli-

gion, and still more of making truth and error dwell always, and by common right, under one name and roof, may well be doubted. Men may soon learn to be indifferent about each other's opinions, and consequently about their own, and to live without much caring what belongs to error and what to truth in religion.

The German-Catholic church is such a common dwelling, under whose roof the most discordant faiths may meet in fellowship, and rejoice in a common name without having a common doctrine, or a common Bible, or, which is the same, without having a common understanding of what is in the Bible. This may be a very useful social institution, very conducive to peace, and a tranquil apathy of mankind to all religious agitation or ferment, but it is not a Christian church. Its highest aim and object is not a spiritual, but a social, intellectual, and moral good. Great have been the evils, no doubt, of religious dissension to the human race. All the influences and excitements which have raised the hand of man against his fellow-man since the establishment of Christianity have not shed so much human blood as Christians themselves have spilt in religious dissensions, in the persecution or defence, the propagation or extermination, of different religious

doctrines. But what does this prove? That men should drop all religious doctrine, all distinction of faith? That men should return to the social and religious state of Rome or Athens, before Christianity was established, when all religions were equally inefficient on the moral realities here, and the spiritual hopes hereafter, and the great mass of the human race consisted of animal-men without souls, as far as they knew, and living in the darkest slavery of mind and body? It proves, on the contrary, that there is a truth in religion which men will seek through fire and blood, an intellectual spiritual element in human nature, unknown to the heathen world, which is elevating the moral and social condition of man. It proves the power of this intellectual element, this craving after truth, over all human action. Superstition and error may be mistaken for truth, and fire and sword for the proper means to diffuse it, but the moving power in the constitution of man is the same; and if it has worked unhappily and bloodily, it has also worked beneficially and well, in all the social relations of men, has diffused civilisation, morality, virtue, mind, soul, over a brute-mankind. The Christian religion, considered merely from the point of view of its social benefits, has been worth all the price mankind

has paid for it. Religious differences, dissensions, and discords are proofs, at least, of zeal, sincerity, and mind bent upon truth. Would it be an advantage to the human character and intellectuality if these could be put down? The mind of man was not created to exist in apathy, any more than his body in indolence. The miller, according to the proverb, must put up with the clack of his mill, if he will have his mill to work. Society must put up with the evils of religious differences, dissensions, and discords, if society is to have the benefit of a civilisation other than the material animal enjoyments of life, and of a Christianity other than ceremony, words, and forms. The evils inseparable from the infirmity of the mental constitution of man must be taken along with the good of that mental constitution being at work, in movement and in action, upon all social, moral, and virtuous existence here, and on all religious faith and hope in an existence hereafter. The German-Catholic church, covering all religious opinions and principles under a common name, although, in themselves, essentially distinct and inconsistent, lulling all conscientious convictions of right or wrong in religious belief into a silent slumber of apathy and indifference in her common lap, would be of as little intellectual and moral utility as of

religious benefit to society. It would be a mockery of truth to call a body of individuals, or of congregations, one Christian Church, while holding discordant and contradictory belief, laid down in confessions of faith solemnly accepted, upon the most important doctrines of Christianity. Each congregation or group, with its confession of faith, may be a distinct Christian church, but without a common doctrine uniting the parts, like the power of gravity in the physical world, into one whole, the distinct congregations or groups holding doctrines inconsistent with each other cannot be aggregated into one religious body or church, unless doctrine can be, at once, true and false, or unless it has come to this in the public mind in Germany, that all religious opinions and principles are regarded with equal indifference, and that it is considered of no importance —as all one— whether they belong to true or false doctrine. But we are told, gravely, in a pamphlet published in Edinburgh, entitled “John Ronge and the Holy Coat of Trèves,” that “there has been no time to draw up a full and authorised confession of faith for the general body of reformed Catholics.” This is an absurdity. In religion, as in all human affairs, men must have opinions, doctrines, grounds they believe true,

motives, in a word, to move them, before they begin to move. These must precede the first step. What are these opinions, doctrines, or grounds? They must exist, and, like cause before effect, must exist before the religious movement either in the individual Christian, or in a body of Christians. A confession of faith is but a summary, an exposition, an abridgement of those opinions, doctrines, and grounds understood and accepted by all as true and scriptural, and this summary or exposition is not the essential in a Christian church — may be postponed to any time — but the doctrines, opinions, grounds themselves are the essential. Unless men could believe without a subject of belief, or move without a motive, they could enter into no religious movement without having opinions, doctrines, grounds of belief, and could form no community or church, without having common opinions, common doctrines, common grounds of belief. The exposition and summary of these in the formula of a confession of faith, is only a highly convenient condensation of them. An attempt was made at a meeting held at Leipsic, in March, 1845, to bring together under one confession of faith the discordant doctrines of the several congregations, to pare down the seven sacraments, and transub-

stantiation announced as the doctrine solemnly adopted by the congregations of Schneidemühl, Elberfeld, and their groups, to the two sacraments, and the commemorative nature of the Lord's Supper announced as the doctrine solemnly adopted by the congregations of Kreutznach, Leipsic, Breslau, and others. This could only be done by one or other giving up the most essential doctrines of Christianity, (which, unquestionably, the nature of the sacraments are,) and thereby proclaiming that there was no fixed religious doctrine or faith at the bottom of their movement; or by adopting some vague formula as a confession of faith under which all religious doctrines might be arranged. Such a generalism was proposed at Leipsic. It is possible to construct a confession of faith which would include the Mahometan, the Jew, and the Christian in one church. The simple formula, "I believe in God, the Creator of all things," would do this; but would this be a Christian church? The addition by the Leipsic meeting to this formula of the belief also in Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost, and in the Holy Scripture as the foundation of Christian faith, excludes, no doubt, Jew and Mahometan, but includes, equally, the rationalist who, on what he considers scriptural grounds, admits a human

nature only in Christ, and the member of the Schneidemühl congregation who holds Christ to be God transubstantiated into bread and wine. This common formula, propounded at Leipsic, does not express a distinct common doctrine. It is but an unworthy compromise of truth. Dr. Edwin Bauer, a minister of this German-Catholic church in his *Geschichte der Gründung und Fortbildung der Deutsch-Catholischen Kirche* (History of the Origin and Progress of the German-Catholic Church), published in August, 1845, defends and applauds this Leipsic formula, precisely upon account of its vagueness and want of positive Christian doctrine. But this same clergyman, being a rationalist, holds that the Son of God, applied to our Saviour, is a mere Oriental expression, not warranting the doctrine of the sonship of Christ as held in all branches of the Christian Church, page 253; and another rationalist, Professor Bayrhoffer of Marburg, considers and declares the new German-Catholic Church as "standing decidedly upon a foundation of rationalism." No sincere and honest man, whatever his religious opinions may be, could accept of such an unworthy shuffle as to have them expressed in a common formula or confession of faith along with religious opinions.

diametrically opposite. The attempt is no favourable indication of the religious sincerity and honesty of the Leipsic meeting, and it has deservedly been rejected by some of the congregations; and a schism is already appearing among them on this account.

The radical difference between the Reformation of the sixteenth century and this of the nineteenth — between Luther and Ronge — is, that Luther set out with laying down a basis of distinct doctrine. It was his first step. In his ninety-five celebrated theses against the doctrine of papal indulgences, which, on the 31st of October, 1517, he affixed to the doors of the church at Wittemberg, with the notification that he was ready to defend them before the university, he lays down distinctly the scriptural doctrines of the all-sufficient atonement of the Saviour, and of justification by faith alone. From these scriptural doctrines as a basis, and not from the grounds of social, moral, and intellectual evils arising from the practice, he opposed the sale of indulgences and remissions of sins by the pope's agent, Tetzler. He first laid down his doctrine, and then applied it to the abuse. Luther himself, at a later period, said, that by proclaiming the doctrine of justification by faith he had “laid the axe to the root.”

“It is the doctrine,” says he, “we attack in the followers of the Pope. Huss and Wickliffe only attacked their lives; but in attacking their doctrine we seize the goose by the neck.”

Ronge attacks the abuses, but not the doctrines. He does not take the goose by the neck. He exposes the idolatry, superstition, and ignorance of the people under the yoke of the church of Rome, the evils of auricular confession, interference in mixed marriages, celibacy of the priesthood, and other abuses; but he does not supply the scriptural doctrines upon which these are to be rejected. He opposes them as social, economical, moral, intellectual evils, not as abuses arising from doctrines religiously false and unscriptural, and to be cut off in their doctrinal root. Czerzki, who, next to Ronge, is considered to be the head of the movement, declares distinctly, in his justification of his schism from Rome, that he is not to be considered a Lutheran, nor a Calvinist, nor a Mennonite, but that he is still a Catholic priest, only he has renounced the authority, superstitions, and abuses of the church of Rome. But this is childishness in religious reasoning. If he renounce the authority, superstitions, and abuses of the church of Rome, he, of necessity, must, as an honestly reasoning man,

renounce the false doctrines upon which these are founded. One and all of them, even the most absurd, are regularly deduced from scriptural grounds falsely understood and interpreted. It is the false meaning, false interpretation, false importance given to isolated passages of Scripture, as grounds of religious belief or observance, that constitute the false doctrine. The authority of the pope, of the hierarchy, and all the abuses, and superstitions, and errors of the church of Rome, are legitimate deductions from false premises. To hold fast by the premises, yet reject the conclusions — to retain the false doctrine, yet repudiate the abuses flowing in fair reasoning from it—is not the sound use of mind. What are the religious doctrines of Ronge, Czerzki, Kerbler, and their congregations, if they are neither Lutheran, Calvinist, Mennonite, if they are not Protestant in any branch, but only Catholic? The Catholic of the church of Rome holds false doctrines, and, sincerely believing them to be true, gives effect to them in his religious observances, and life, in a thousand superstitions and idolatrous usages. The Catholic of Ronge's and Czerzki's church holds, it appears, the same false doctrines, but without the same sincerity. Knowing them to be false, he does not give effect

to them in his religious life and practice ; nevertheless, if there be any meaning at all in Czerzki's declaration, he retains them. This is no religious and no moral improvement, like the Reformation of Luther. Luther himself, unfortunately for the Protestant church, did not sweep his house clean. Setting out with the clear and distinct doctrine of the all-sufficient atonement by the Saviour, and of justification by faith alone in that atonement, he did not, like Calvin and John Knox, sweep out of his church all the so-called pious works, ceremonies, forms, altars, wax candles, robes, saints' days, and such adjutary helps to the Saviour's perfected atonement, as being, in sound reasoning, impiously derogatory to the completeness and perfection of that full atonement. The Lutheran church and her sister, the church of England, are only beginning now, in our generation, to feel the effects of this want of consistency between Luther's doctrine and Luther's practice. The sanctimonious nugæ of ceremonies, observances of forms, episcopalian sanctities, and holy doings on holy saints' birth-days, or martyrdom days, popish weeds which Luther left behind, are growing strong and smothering the stem. The fungi are at the heart of the root, and both these branches of the Protestant church

are in rapid decay, becoming a mass of rottenness, and fast amalgamating with the church of Rome, or with rationalism. Luther, from his political position, and probably from his early prejudices, or a feeling for his early convictions, of which no sincere honest man, as Luther was, can entirely divest himself, retained those seeds of superstitious and venerable ceremonials, and of credence in human sanctity, although inconsistent with his own doctrine of the all-sufficient atonement of the Saviour, and of justification by faith in it. Knox, a man of stronger, sterner mind, superior reasoning intellect, and more tried and devoted attachment to the right, the abstract right, in doctrine, went through with the very same principle of the complete atonement, and justification by it alone, to its fullest end and issue, and swept away all courtly consideration of saintly or episcopalian holiness in man, or in devices, ceremonies, or forms enacted by man, as aiding means to complete the efficiency of Christ's atonement and of man's belief in it. John Knox was, indeed, a man in mind. He saw the end from the beginning, and never swerved from the road to it. His church enjoys now the benefit of his uncompromising straight-forward reasoning; and is full of vitality, and energy, and a common doctrine in

its three divisions of free, secession, and residuary, while the other churches of the Reformation of the sixteenth century are dormant, or falling off, in their slumbers, to popery, on the one hand, or to rationalism, on the other.

The progress and present extent of this religious movement in Germany may be estimated from the work, above quoted, of Dr. Edwin Bauer, one of its ministers. In the month of August last, the number of congregations he states to be 165, and of ministers 37. The accessions since will scarcely have brought the number of congregations up to 200, because the first impetus was over before August. Those who took their ground upon the social and moral evils of the church of Rome did so at once, and no doctrine to lay hold of, except rationalistic doctrine, has been since supplied by the leaders of the movement. The number of members in each congregation is surprisingly small. From 40 to 100 members are the numbers of persons in the majority of the congregations. The congregation of Dresden, the capital of a Protestant country, in which there can be no intimidation, or peculiar discouragement, to the German-Catholic church, has only 263 members out of a Roman Catholic population in the city of 6000 souls. It may be a full

average to reckon 200 members to each of 200 congregations, which would give 40,000 persons as the numbers of the population belonging to the German-Catholic church in Germany. Of the 37 ministers few have any fixed permanent incomes from these congregations. The duty of supporting their ministers is not understood, and it is one of the most unpromising features in the movement. A church of 165 congregations, and 37 ministers without adequate means of subsistence, is a small demonstration of zeal.

It is probably in America, not in Germany, that the German-Catholic church will first raise its head. The Catholic population is numerous in the United States, and principally of German descent and language. Social action there is free to follow conviction, especially in religion. Nationality, or the segregation of the general family of mankind into distinct groups, or nations, is of very questionable social or moral worth, and of unquestionable Christian worthlessness. It is, however, the spirit appealed to by Ronge, and the leaders of the movement, as a suitable basis for the German-Catholic church. In America this spirit of nationality is a real and intense influence. In Germany it is but a vapour in the mind of a small reading class. The many, divided


into little groups with distinct and even hostile interests and objects, know nothing of it. In America it is possible this spirit, aiding a better and more enlightened spirit, may shake off the European pope and hierarchy. The American Roman Catholics at Cincinnati have already held a meeting upon this subject. If, in that country, the people cannot or will not throw off the yoke of the church of Rome, it is not in Germany that a people without freedom of mind, person, or property, without freedom to travel, to publish their thoughts, or to contribute their means to common ends, can be expected to accomplish such a work ; unless, as in the sixteenth century, they are aided by the political interests or objects of their rulers.

When the reader of this tract weighs these considerations, and considers also the very amiable, very soft, very submissive character of the German population of the present times, the great influence over them of habitual ease, and enjoyment of innocent but trifling amusements and animal gratifications, which too often absorb all higher interests and objects in German life ; the habit, too, of involving life in speculation only, of thinking boldly, but acting feebly or not at all, and sitting down content with having strong con-

victions and never applying them ; he will suspend, as well as the author, his first sanguine expectations of this movement. Let us watch patiently the further development of this phenomenon appearing in the German horizon, before we venture to form a decided opinion on its true shape and course. Let us see if it expand itself into a glorious orb of purest Christian light, eclipsing the artificial lustre of the dome of St. Peter's, or the cupola of St. Paul's, or if it turn out to be nothing but a German smoke-balloon.

THE END.

LONDON:
Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-Street-Square.





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

10 Oct '62 KL

REC'D LD

JAN 31 1963

RENEWED

JUN 3 1963



THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA


YC151579

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERS



THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERS



LIBRARY OF CALIFORNIA



